2584
P31g

St. Mark's Library
THE
General Theological
Seminary

Chelsea Square · New York
Maryland Diocesan Library
The Memorial Library
of the Reverend Edwin A. Dalrymple.
Whittingham Collection

AN ANALYSIS

OF

Pearson on the Creed;

WITH EXAMINATION QUESTIONS.

BY THE REV. J. GORLE, M.A.

Rector of Whatcote, Warwickshire.

Sixth Edition.

CAMBRIDGE:—J. HALL & SON;

LONDON:—SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.; WHITTAKER & CO.;

AND G. BELL & SONS. OXFORD:—JAS. PARKER & CO.

1884.

238.1
P31g
195413

Printed by J. Hall & Son,
Cambridge.

ADVERTISEMENT.

It has been the Author's endeavour to make this Analysis a clearly arranged abridgement of Pearson on the Creed. He believes that scarcely any of the substance of the text of Pearson is omitted; the notes are but sparingly quoted or referred to, from a regard to the limits of such a work as the present. He hopes his humble labour may be found useful, and requests the reader kindly to pardon any defects in the execution of what has been designed.

THE APOSTLES' CREED

In the Original Greek.

Πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν. τὸν συλληφθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, παθόντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, σταυρωθέντα, θανόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, κατελθόντα εἰς ᾅδου, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανους, καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς παντοδυνάμου, ἐκεῖθεν ερχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Πιστεύω εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἁγίων κοινωνίαν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Ἀμήν.

CONTENTS.

		Page
ART. I.	I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth ...	1
§. 1.	I believe	*id.*
§. 2.	In God	13
§. 3.	The Father	23
§. 4.	Almighty	37
§. 5.	Maker of Heaven and Earth ...	43
ART. II.	And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord	64
§. 1.	In Jesus	*id.*
§. 2.	Christ	75
§. 3.	His only Son	111
§. 4.	Our Lord	157
ART. III.	Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary ...	170
§. 1.	Conceived.....born	171
§. 2.	Conceived by the Holy Ghost ...	177
§. 3.	Born of the Virgin Mary	183
ART. IV.	Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried	192
§. 1.	Suffered	193
§. 2.	Under Pontius Pilate	205
§. 3.	Was Crucified	210
§. 4.	Dead	218
§. 5.	Buried	226

ART. V.	He descended into Hell; the third day He rose again from the dead ...	231
§. 1.	Descended into Hell	*id.*
§. 2.	Rose again	253
	From the dead	256
	The Third day	260
ART. VI.	He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty	270
§. 1.	Ascended into Heaven	*id.*
§. 2.	Sitteth on the Right Hand	276
	Almighty	287
ART. VII.	From thence He shall come to judge the Quick and the Dead	293
	He shall come	294
	From thence...	295
	To judge	*id.*
	The Quick and the Dead	302
ART. VIII.	I believe in the Holy Ghost ...	307
ART. IX.	The Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints	334
§. 1.	The Holy Catholic Church	335
§. 2.	The Communion of Saints ...	351
ART. X.	The Forgiveness of Sins	363
ART. XI.	The Resurrection of the Body ...	375
ART. XII.	And the Life Everlasting	395

ANALYSIS

OF

PEARSON ON THE CREED.

ARTICLE I.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.

§. 1. I BELIEVE.

1. *Credo, I believe*, whence the name *Creed*, though but twice actually rehearsed, is virtually prefixed to every Article, and to every single truth: *e. g. I believe in God, I believe* that *God* to be *the Father, I believe* that *Father* to be *Almighty*, &c.
2. The expression, *I believe*, is to be considered, I. As it supposes *Belief* or *Faith*. II. As a *Confession* of that Faith. III. As both the Faith and Confession are *matters of obligation*.
3. I. Definition of *Belief* in general: *an assent to that which is credible*, AS *credible*. *All* belief is an assent to *that which is credible*; yet *every* such assent may *not* be properly *Faith: e. g.* He who sees an action done assents to the truth of its

---

1. Whence is the name *Creed* derived? To what extent of particulars does the expression *I believe* refer? 2. In what respects is it to be considered? 3. Define *Belief*, or *Faith*, in general.

performance because he sees it; but another person may assent to the same truth because he who saw it relates it: in which case *that which is credible* is the object of *Faith* in the one, of *Knowledge* in the other.

4. That is properly *credible* which (*a*) *Is not apparent* of itself, as being *evident* to *sense*, or to the *understanding*; such things are said properly to be *known*:—(*b*) Is *not certainly* to be *collected* either by its *cause* or *effect*, as propositions in mathematics and conclusions in other sciences, which propositions, &c. are said to be *scientifical*; and the comprehension of them is *Science*:—(*c*) Is *not* such a thing as—though *appearing* to most as *true* by some *external relation* to *other truths*, yet—admits a *possibility of falsehood*; whatsoever is thus apprehended, even if depending on real arguments, is called only *probable*, and an assent to it is properly *Opinion*:—but (*d*) Appears to us true *not* by a *manifestation*, *but attestation*, of the truth, and so moves us to assent *not of itself*, *but* by virtue of *the testimony given to it*; this is said *properly* to be *credible*; and an assent to this on such *credibility* is properly *Faith* or *Belief*.

5. A *diversity* of *credibility* necessarily arises from the *different authority* of the *testimony* on which it depends, an *authority* founded on (*a*) the testifier's *ability* in the knowledge of what he asserts, and (*b*) his *integrity* in asserting according to his knowledge.

6. There are two kinds of *credibility*, *Human* and *Divine*; grounded respectively on the *testimony* of

---

4. Define what is, *properly*, *credible*: and distinguish the *assent* given *on account of Credibility* from *Knowledge*, *Science*, and *Opinion*. 5. Whence arises the *Diversity* of *Credibility*? In what does the *Authority* of a *Testimony* consist? 6. What are the two kinds of Credibility?

man and of *God:* consequently there is a twofold *Faith*, a *Human* and a *Divine Faith.*

7. *Human Faith* is *an assent unto any thing credible merely upon the testimony of man.* Upon this kind of faith we proceed in the ordinary affairs of life; by this faith we are assured of each others' affections; doubt not of things we never saw; without this no business is prosecuted. Our belief, however, relies on the *ability* and *integrity* of the relator, and therefore,—since (*a*) the *knowledge* of *all men* is *imperfect*, and (*b*) the *hearts* of *all men* are *deceitful*,—there can be no *infallible universal ground* of *Human Faith.* But

8. *Divine Faith*, which is *an assent unto something as credible upon the testimony of God*, is the highest kind of faith, because the object has the highest credibility, as being grounded on the *infallible* testimony of *God.* For, (*a*) *God is of infinite knowledge and wisdom.* "The Lord is a God of knowledge;" 1 Sam. ii. 3. "Of His understanding there is no number;" Psal. cxlvii. 5. "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all;" 1 John i. 5. "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight;" Heb. iv. 13. Wherefore, since all things are within His knowledge, and most clear and evident to Him, and since His knowledge is most certain and infallible, *He cannot be deceived in any thing.* (*b*) *God is of infinite justice and holiness.* "A God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is He;" Deut. xxxii. 4. "If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful, He cannot deny Himself;"

---

on what respectively founded? And what is the corresponding distinction in regard to Faith? 7. What is *Human* Faith? In what matters are we guided by this Faith? Why can there be no *infallible universal* ground of it? 8. What is *Divine* Faith? Why is the testimony of God infallible? Quote texts in proof and illustration of those perfections of God which give authority to His

2 Tim. ii. 13. And though "God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath, that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation," Heb. vi. 17, 18. ; yet it is as impossible for God to lie without an oath as with one ; because He can swear by no greater, He sweareth only by Himself, so that the strength even of His oath relies on His veracity. Wherefore, since God as God is of infinite rectitude, goodness, and holiness, *He cannot deceive any man.—God*, therefore, being *infinitely wise cannot be deceived*, being *infinitely good cannot deceive :* on these two immovable pillars stands the authority of His testimony. That truth then which is testified by God hath a *Divine Credibility*, and an *assent* unto it *as so credible* is *Divine Faith.*

9. The *Testimony* of *God* is given by way of *Revelation*, *i. e.* the delivery or speech of God unto His creatures. Therefore on a diversity of delivery must follow a difference, though not of faith itself, yet of the means and manner of assent.

10. Divine *Revelation* is either *Immediate*, by which God delivereth Himself to man *by Himself* without the intervention of man ; or *Mediate*, the conveyance of the counsel of God to man *by man.*

11. Those to whom God did *immediately* speak Himself (or by an angel representing God) did by the same Revelation perceive and know at the same time both *what* was delivered and *by Whom.*

---

testimony. 9. In what way is the Testimony of God given ? What difference must follow on a diversity of its delivery ? 10. What diversity of delivery is there in regard to Divine Revelation ? What is *Mediate* Divine Revelation ? 11. What *Immediate* ? Give Scripture instances.

e. g. α. Abraham would not have resolved to slay his son, nor have been commended for such a resolution, had he not been most assured that it was God who by immediate revelation commanded it. β. "By Faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet,.....prepared an ark, to the saving of his house;" Heb. xi. 7. He was as well assured of the author of the warning as informed of the command. γ. The judgments hanging over Judah were "revealed in the ears of Isaiah by the Lord of hosts;" Isai. xxii. 14. δ. "The Lord revealed Himself to Samuel in Shiloh;" (1 Sam. iii. 21.).....he fully understood the words or things delivered, and certainly knew that the deliverer was God: ε. so *all the Prophets* believed those truths revealed to them by such a faith as was firm assent unto an object credible on the *immediate* testimony of God.

12 But those faithful people to whom the prophets spake, believed the same truth, and on the testimony of the same God, delivered to them, not by God, but by those prophets whose words they assented to as truths only because assured that what the prophets spake was *immediately* revealed to *them* by God Himself. When God appeared to Moses, Exod. iii. 2. and *immediately* revealed to him first Himself, "I am the God of thy fathers, &c." and then His will, to deliver the children of Israel, Moses believed God in both respects, but doubted whether the Israelites would believe the same truth when delivered to them *mediately* by Moses: "they will not be-

---

12--15. Through whom were Divine Revelations at different times made to mankind? How did persons inspired to reveal the will of God establish their claim to the belief of those whom they addressed? 12. On what was the faith both of Moses and of the Israelites founded? In what respect did his and theirs differ?

lieve me,.....for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee; Exod. iv. 1. But this his rational objection was taken away when God endued him with power of evident miracles: they who saw in his hand God's omnipotency could not suspect in his tongue God's veracity: they then assented, and "believed the Lord and his servant Moses;" Exod. xiv. 31.; they believed Moses that God had made a revelation to *him;* they believed the promise because *God* had revealed it. The faith therefore both of Moses and of the Israelites was grounded on the same Testimony of God, and differed only in the proposition or application of the Testimony; Moses receiving it *immediately*, the Israelites *mediately*.

13. In like manner the succeeding Prophets were the instruments of Divine Revelation. It was God who "spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began;" Luke i. 70. "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me," saith David, "and His word was in my tongue." 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. It was the word of the Lord which He spake "by the hand of Moses," 1 Kings viii. 53. and "of His servant Ahijah the Prophet." 1 Kings xiv. 18. The words which Balaam's ass spake were as much the ass's words as those which Balaam spake were his; for "the Lord opened the mouth of the ass," and "the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth;" Numb. xxii. 28. and xxiii. 5. "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation;" 2 Pet. i. 20. *i. e.* did so proceed from the Prophet who spake or wrote it, that he of himself did so prophesy; "for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of

---

13–16. Make also a similar distinction in the case of inspired propounders of revealed truth and receivers of it from them, subsequently to the time of Moses.

God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." What they delivered was, therefore, the Revelation of God ; to which *they* assented as a certain truth credible on the *immediate* Testimony of God, and *the rest of the believers* on the same Testimony of God *mediately* delivered by the prophets.

14. Thus "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets," Heb. i. 1. and so propounded the object of Faith both to the Prophets and the Fathers, "hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son," Heb. i. 2. and so hath enlarged the object of faith to us by Him, whence it becomes the *Faith of Jesus.* i. "The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, &c." John i. 18. see also Heb. i. 3. Col. i. 19 ; ii. 9 ; revealed the will of God to the Apostles. "I have given unto them," saith Christ unto his Father, "the words which Thou gavest Me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me ;" John xvii. 8. ii. Moreover, they received the promise of the "Spirit of Truth," who should "guide them into all truth, &c." John xiv. 26.— Thus the Faith of the Apostles, as of Moses and the Prophets, was grounded on the *immediate* Revelations of God.

15. But those believers to whom the Apostles preached believed the same truths, though not *immediately* revealed to *them*, which were revealed to the Apostles ; who gave to their believing hearers, as Moses to the Israelites, sufficient testimony that it was God who spake by their mouths, who so evidently wrought by their

---

14. Through whom was the will of God pre-eminently revealed ?

hands.—"Neither pray I for these alone" (the Apostles) saith Christ, "but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word;" John xvii. 20. The Apostles believed on Christ through His own word, the primitive Christians on the same Christ through the Apostles' word—called *theirs* not because distinct from His, but because delivered by their ministry. "That which was from the beginning, &c. That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you;" 1 John i. 1. 3. The believers, as they attributed the miracles which the Apostles wrought to *God* working by them, so did also attribute that saving word which they spake to the same God speaking by them....."almost the whole city (Antioch) came together to hear the word of God;" Acts xiii. 44; so they esteemed it though spoken by Paul. The Thessalonians "when they received the word of God which they heard of him, (Paul).....received it *not* as the word of *man, but*.....of *God*;" (1 Thess. ii. 13.), and so embraced it as infallibly true, and believed it, on the testimony *ultimately* of God, *immediately* of St Paul. See 2 Thess. i. 10. Thus the faith of the converts of the Apostles was *an assent unto the word as credible on the testimony of God, delivered to them by a testimony Apostolical.*

16. And now to describe the nature of *our own* Faith:—Neither the Miracles wrought by Moses, nor Moses himself, did for ever continue with the Israelites; yet they through all generations were obliged to believe the truths delivered by him as the word of God, because "he received the *lively oracles* to give unto them;" Acts vii. 38.

---

16. How did the belief in the revelations made through Moses and other inspired propounders of the will of God continue obligatory after the death of such persons?

and moreover by foretelling the prophets to be afterwards raised up, he further obliged the people to believe *their* prophecies, as revelations of the same God. Thus they all, in all ages, believed Moses; by believing, while he lived, his words; after his death, his writings. Wherefore the faith of the Israelites in Canaan was *an assent to the truths of the Law as credible on the testimony of God delivered to them in the writings of Moses and the Prophets.* In like manner is it now with us. For though Christ first published the Gospel to "those who beheld His glory." John i. 14. though the Apostles first converted to the faith those who witnessed their wonderful works, yet after their death, and the cessation, not long after, of the power of frequent and ordinary miraculous operations, they left as great an obligation on the Church in all succeeding ages to believe all the truths delivered by them as they had put on those who heard their words and saw their works; because they *wrote* the same truths which they spake, assisted in writing by the same Spirit by which they spake. i. The Israelites believed the words of Moses and the Prophets while they lived, afterwards their writings. ii. The Apostles during Christ's life on earth believed the writings of Moses and the Prophets, and also the words of Christ: iii. After Christ's Ascension and the coming down of the Holy Ghost, the new-converted Christians believed the writings of the Prophets and the words of the Apostles: and iv. after the death of the Apostles themselves the Christians have believed the writings of Moses and the Prophets, of the Apostles and Evangelists, in

---

Describe briefly the Faith of the Israelites; of the Apostles; of the Christians converted by the Apostles; and of Christians since that time to the present. Out of

which together is comprehended whatsoever may properly be termed matter of *Divine Faith.* The true nature therefore of the Faith of a Christian *now* consists in its being *an assent to truths credible on the testimony of God delivered to us in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets.* To *believe* therefore, as the word stands in the beginning of the *Creed* and is virtually diffused through every article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it as to a certain truth revealed by God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived, and delivered to us in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets immediately inspired by Him; out of whose writings this brief sum of necessary points of Faith was first collected.

17. II. To say *I believe* is also to make a *confession* of the Faith.

Faith is a habit of the intellectual part of man, therefore of itself *invisible:* and to believe is a spiritual act, consequently *internal* and known to no man but the believer. Wherefore Christ, being not only the author of our Faith, but also the Head of the Church, and so the author of union and communion, which principally hath relation to the unity of Faith, must needs be imagined to have appointed some *external* expression and communication of it; especially considering that all nations were to be gathered into His Church, which cannot be performed without a *profession* of Faith, without which no entrance into the Church, no admittance to

---

whose writings was the Creed first collected? And what is the nature of the assent we give to it in professing to *believe?*

17. Why must it needs be thought that Christ appointed some *external* expression of Faith? Before what rite of the Christian Church has such expression been always required? Quote Scripture instances.

Baptism. It was on believing with all his heart and making *profession* of his Faith that the Ethiopian Eunuch was admitted to it. Acts viii. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation;" Rom. x. 10. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved;" Rom. x. 9. This faith of the heart every one ought and is presumed to have; this confession of the mouth every one is known to make when he pronounces these words of the Creed, *I believe.*

18. III. 1. Of the *necessity*—and 2. *particular obligation*—to make such a confession.

1. (*a*) Truth naturally desires the light; and this were sufficient to move us to a confession of our Faith, the object of which is true. But beyond this,—(*b*) From the same God, and by the same means by which we have received the object of our Faith, we have received a command to make a confession of the same: "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you;" 1 Pet. iii. 15., such answer requiring an acknowledgment of the faith on which the *reason of hope* must be grounded.—(*c*) The promises and praises given in the Gospel to Faith, are also given to the *confession* of Faith together with it. See Rom. x. 10. "Whosoever shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also, &c." Matt. x. 32.—(*d*) The profession of the Faith of individual Christians tends to mutual edification.—(*e*) The matters of Faith are so excellent that the confession of it glorifies God, and how can

---

18. Why are Christians under a necessity of making confession of their Faith? Quote texts in proof and

we expect to enter into that glory which is not ours, if we deny Him that glory which is His?—(*f*) The not acknowledging that faith we are thought to believe dishonours it, and casts a kind of contumely on its author. "Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and of My words, &c." Luke ix. 26.—Such is the *necessity* of Confession of Faith, in respect of God, of ourselves, and of our brethren. Wherefore the Church required the recitation of the Creed at Baptism, and in the celebration of the Eucharist, as also constant inculcation of the same by the Clergy to the people.

19. 2. The *obligation* to believe and confess binds every single Christian;—"*I* believe." As if to Christ's question, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" John ix. 35. every one should answer, "Lord, I believe:" as if to Christ's promise, "If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth;" Mark ix. 23. each for himsel fshould answer, "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief." Not that we may not say, "*We* believe:" addition of charity cannot disparage profession of faith. St Peter answered for the twelve, "We believe and are sure that Thou art the Christ, &c." John vi. 69. and though "one of them was a devil," St Peter is not blamed, who knew it not. But every one is taught to express his own faith, because by that he is to stand or fall. It should be manifested by a particular confession, because effectual by particular application.

---

illustration. On what occasions did the Church require the recitation of the Creed? 19. Are Christians under an obligation *individually* both to believe and confess? Is *individual* profession of faith inconsistent with a *common* profession of it? Why is every individual Christian bound to believe and confess?

Summary of Truths confessed in ART. I. §. 1.

20. I. Although those things which I am ready to affirm be *not apparent* to my *sense*, (so that I cannot say I *see* them,)—*not self-evident* to my *understanding nor appearing* to me *true* by virtue of any *natural* or *necessary cause*, (so that I cannot say I have any proper *knowledge* or *science* of them,)—yet—because they are contained in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets, because those Apostles and Prophets were endued with miraculous power from above, and inspired by the Holy Ghost, and because their word consequently was not that of man but of God, because God being infinitely wise cannot be deceived, being infinitely good cannot deceive, and consequently whatever He hath delivered must be true—*I assent unto them as most certain truths.* II. III. And because God hath revealed them not for my benefit only, but for that of others, and also for the manifestation of His own glory, and because for those ends He hath commanded me to profess them, and hath promised an eternal reward on such profession, and because every particular person is to expect his justification and salvation on the condition of his own faith,—therefore *I will with a fixed resolution profess them.*—And with this faith in my heart, and confession in my mouth, in respect of the whole Creed and every article and particle in it, I BELIEVE.

ART. I. §. 2. I BELIEVE IN GOD.

21. There can be no Divine Faith without the attestation of *God*, and no such attestation without an existence of the testifier : therefore the confession of our faith must properly begin with the agnition of our God.

---

20. Give a summary of truths confessed by every Christian when in the Creed he says *I believe.* 21. Why must the confession of our Faith properly begin with the acknowledgment of belief in God?

22. The words "*I believe in God*" are to be considered,

23. I. As to the *phrase*, or *manner of speech*. For to *believe* with the addition of the preposition *in* is a phrase ordinarily conceived fit to be given to God only, as implying, beside faith, love and affiance. An observation prevailing especially in the Latin Church, principally on St Augustin's authority. But the Greeks, in whose language the New Testament was written, made no such constant distinction in their deliveries of the Creed; and in the Hebrew language of the Old, whence the Jewish and Christian Greeks received the phrase of *believing in*, it has no such peculiar signification; being used in relation to God, to the Prophets, to Miracles, to the Law of God. In this confession of Faith it is most proper to admit it in the last mentioned acceptation, *i. e.* as attributed to the *material object of belief*. Nor could the Greek Fathers mean any thing further: for sometimes they do not apply *believing in* to the *Father*, *Son*, nor *Holy Ghost*; sometimes, using it as to *Them*, they use it *also* as to the *Catholic Church*, *&c.*; and generally speak of the Creed as mere matter of faith, without including any intimation of hope, love, &c. The phrase

---

22, 23, 24. In what respects are the words *I believe in God* to be considered? [For answer to this and the *like* questions, look to the *beginnings* of paragraphs referred to which contain the heads of division: this mode of reference is adopted for the sake of brevity, on which account the statements of heads of division given *all together* in *Pearson*, *previously* to their being stated *singly*, are in this Analysis, generally, omitted.] 23. What was the prevailing opinion in the Latin Church, and grounded on whose authority, respecting the extent of meaning implied by *believing in* (with the preposition)? Shew that that opinion appears to have no foundation in the language of the Old Testament, and not to be favoured by the usage of Jewish or

therefore asserts in respect of God merely His *existence:—I believe in God*, i. e. *I believe that God is:* the foundation however of *all* Articles of our faith: "He that cometh to God must believe that He *is*." Heb. xi. 6.

24. II. As to the *nature* of the truth expressed:

1. As regards the *notion* of *God*. The name of *God* is here to be understood of Him who by way of eminency and excellency bears it, and is therefore styled "God of Gods;" Deut. x. 17. "the most High God;" Gen. xiv. 18. "God over all;" Rom. ix. 5. This exclusive eminency and excellency is grounded on the divine nature or essence. "When ye knew not God, ye did service to them which by nature are not Gods;" Gal. iv. 8. There is then a God by nature, and others called Gods not so by nature, as either having no power, because no real being, as the Gods of the heathen; or, if having power, whence some are called *Gods* in Scripture, yet having it not from themselves, but from Him who "only hath *immortality*," 1 Tim. vi. 16., and consequently only *Divinity*, and therefore is the *only true God*. The notion of a Deity then signifies a Being or Nature of infinite perfection, which consists in its being (*a*) That which exists necessarily and independently, and is causative of all other Beings; (*b*) That on which all things else depend; and (*c*) That by which all things else are governed. We cannot give a perfect definition of the infinite God, yet we have a sense of this divinity, the first and common

---

Christian Greek writers. What then is asserted in saying I *believe in* God? 24, 25. 34. In what respects may the nature of the truth thus expressed be considered? 24. Of whom is the name of God in this Article to be understood? In what cases is it otherwise applied? and how does such application differ from that here made? What does the common notion of a Deity signify, and in what particulars does it consist?

notion of which consists in the three particulars just stated.

25. 2. A. As regards the *Existence* of *God*. *How* it becomes known to us is not so unanimously agreed on as that it *is*. i. Some have imagined the knowledge of a Deity connatural to the soul of man, so that every man hath a connate notion of a God. But if (as I conceive) the soul of man be at first like a fair smooth table without any actual characters of knowledge imprinted in it, if all our knowledge comes successively by sensation, instruction, and rational collection, then we must not refer the apprehension of a Deity to any connate notion: at least God never charges us with the knowledge of Him on that account. ii. Others affirm that the existence of God is a truth self-evident, so as whosoever hears but these terms named, that *God is*, and understands their meaning, cannot but thereon acknowledge it for a certain truth. Yet can we not ground our knowledge of God's existence on any such clear and immediate evidence, nor were it safe to lay it on such a ground, because whosoever should deny it could not thus be convinced.

26. Though therefore that *God is* be of itself an immediate, certain, necessary truth, yet must it be evinced to us by its connexion with other truths; so that the Being of the Creator may appear to us by His creature, and the dependency of inferior entities lead us to acknowledgment of the supreme independent Being. "The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; even His eternal power and Godhead;" Rom. i. 20.

---

25. Why may we not imagine the knowledge of the existence of God connatural to the human soul? Why not affirm His existence to be a self-evident truth? 26. How then does it become known to us?

27. (*a*) We find by experience of *ourselves* that some things in this world have a beginning, before which they were not. Now if there be anything that had a beginning, there must be *something* which had *no beginning*, because nothing can be a beginning to itself. Whatsoever is, must have been made or not made ; and *something* there must be which was *never made*, because *all* things *cannot* be *made*. For whatsoever is made is made by another, neither can any thing produce *itself ;* otherwise it would follow that the *same* thing, at the *same* instant, in the *same* respect, *is*, because a producer ; *is not*, because to be produced :—a manifest contradiction. If then all things which are made were made by some other, that other either was produced, or was not ; if *not*, we have already an Independent Being ; if it *were*, we must *at last* come to something which was never made, or else admit either a circle of productions, in which the effect shall make its own cause, or an infinite succession of causalities, by which nothing will be made : both equally impossible. And though these effects or dependent Beings *singly* considered do not infer one supreme cause of them all, yet the admirable order and connexion of things shew as much. For all things which we know have their existence for some end, and from such *final* causes (*i. e.* ends of their existence) we must needs collect a prime efficient cause of all things, endued with infinite wisdom, who designed, produced, and disposed them to those ends.

28. (*b*) Again, all things have, as their *existence*, so also their *operations*, for some end ; and whatsoever worketh so must be *directed* to it. Although then creatures endued with reason can appreciate the

---

27. State the proofs of the existence of God to be drawn from our own existence, and from that of all things that are made. 28. From the *operations* of natural agents.

end for which they work, and choose suitable means, and direct themselves to it, yet we cannot conceive this of *irrational* natural agents; *e. g.* a falling stone, growing wheat. And even *men* in natural actions use no act of deliberation; *e. g.* pulsation, digestion, &c. Those natural agents then which work constantly for those ends which they cannot perceive must be directed by some high and overruling Wisdom: and who can be their Director in all their operations tending to those ends but He who gave them their being for those ends? And who is that but the great Artificer who works in all of them? What the *Artificer* is to works of *Art*, who orders and disposes them to other ends than by nature they were made, that is the *Maker* of all things to all *natural agents*, directing all their operations to ends which they cannot apprehend; and thus appears the *Maker* to be the *Ruler* of the world. Thus by the testimony of the creature we find an eternal and independent Being, on which all things else depend, and by which they are governed: [*par.* 24. (*a*) (*b*) (*c*).]

29. (*c*) This too is not any private ratiocination, but the public and universal reason of the world in all ages, countries, and nations. i. The wide-spread conquests of Rome found no nation without its God: the modern discoveries made in another part of the world have shewn the people though widely differing in manner of religion from any professed in these parts, yet agreeing in acknowledgment of a Divinity and celebration of some religious observances. ii. Or if any nation be discovered which makes no profession of piety, and exercises no religious observances, it follows not that they acknowledge no God; they may only, like the Epicureans, deny His providence. iii. Or if any go further, their numbers must be insignificant in respect of mankind.—"I believe in God" has then been the general confession of all nations; and must therefore be a certain truth grounded on principles obvious to all.

---

29. From the universal consent of mankind.

30. (*d*) Moreover, God hath preserved and quickened the worship due unto His name by the patefaction of Himself. The wisest *man* can but *conjecture* things to come : *certain* predictions are clear *Divine* patefactions. For none but He who made all things and gave them power to work, He who ruleth all things and directeth all their operations to their ends, He on whose will the actions of all things depend, can foresee the effects depending merely on those causes. Therefore by whatever means we may be assured of a *Prophecy*, we may be secured of a *Divinity*.

31. (*e*) Again, the works of nature are uniform, and there is a certain sphere of every body's power. Therefore any action performed beyond the power of any natural agent, any thing wrought by the intervention of a body having no proportion to, nor natural aptitude for, the work, must be ascribed to a Cause transcending all natural causes, and disposing all their operations. Thus every *Miracle* proves its *Author*, every act of *omnipotency* a *Deity*.

32. (*f*) Further, every person hath in himself a remembrancer of his Creator, Lord, and Judge. We know there is a great force of *Conscience* in all men, by which their thoughts are ever *accusing* or *excusing* them : they feel a comfort in the virtuous actions wrought by them according to their rule, a remorse for all vitious acts and impious machinations. A false opinion of God, and a superstitious persuasion which hath nothing of the true God in it, may indeed breed a remorse of conscience in those who think it true, and some may hence conclude such force of conscience only grounded on an *opinion, possibly false*, of a Deity. But if it be a truth, as the testimonies of the wisest writers of most different persuasions, and experience of

---

30. From Prophecy. 31. From Miracles. 32. From Conscience.

all sorts of most various persons, agree, that the remorse of conscience can *never* be *obliterated*, then it rather *proves* than *supposes* an opinion of a Divinity. Let Caligula professing himself an Atheist, hide his head..... when the thunder strikes his ears, or the lightning flashes in his eyes; those terrible works of nature remind him of the *power*, and his own guilt of the *justice* of *God;* whom in his wilful opinion weakly denying, in his involuntary action he strongly asserts. So that a Deity will either be granted or extorted, and where not acknowledged will be manifested.

Practical uses of belief in the Existence *of God.*

33. This belief is necessary, (*a*) Because without it there can be no *Divine* Faith, which necessarily requires the existence of God, on whose testimony it is grounded: [*v. supra, par.* 8.]—(*b*) That thereby we may acknowledge such a nature extant as deserves and justly claims our highest worship and adoration. For religion and devotional exercises were vain except there were a Being to whom they were due. Adoration implies submission; there must therefore be some great eminence in the object worshipped, or we should in worshipping dishonour our own nature. But when a Being is presented of intrinsic and necessary perfection, [*v. supra, par.* 24.] our humblest devotions are manifestly but just retributions.

34. 2. B. As regards the *Unity* of God; a truth distinct from that of His *Existence*, yet so necessarily and intimately connected with it that both may be expressed in one word. *I believe in God:* 1. *affirmatively*, I believe *He is*, against *Atheism;* 2. *exclusively* in *God*, not *Gods*, against *Polytheism* and *Idolatry.*—That the *Unity* of the Godhead is here concluded is apparent not only because the Nicene Council so expressed it by way of exposition, but also the Eastern Churches before them had in this Creed "I believe in *one*

---

33. What are the practical uses of belief in the *Existence* of God? 34. How does it appear that the *Unity*, as well as the *Existence*, of God, is included in this Article? Quote texts in support of the Doctrine.

God."—".....The Lord He is God: there is none else beside Him." Deut. iv. 35.—".....There is none other God but one;" 1 Cor. viii. 4.

35. The *Unity* of the Godhead will easily appear as necessary as the *Existence*: (*a*) From the *Nature* of God, which consists in His being the *prime cause* of all things as an Independent Being, on whom all things else depend; and likewise the ultimate end or *final cause* of all: but in this sense *two* prime causes are unimaginable, and for all things to depend on One, and yet for more than One Independent Being to exist, is a clear contradiction. God claims to Himself this primity, "I am the first, I also am the last:" Isai. xlviii. 12. and from it His unity; "...I am the first, and I am the last, and beside Me there is no God:" Isai. xliv. 6.—(*b*) Again, if there were more Gods than One, then were not all perfections in one, neither *formally*, because of their distinction, nor *eminently* and *virtually*, because then one should have power to produce the other, and a *producible* Nature is *not Divine*. Whereas God is absolutely and infinitely perfect, in whom all perfections imaginable must be contained, all simply such *formally*, all implying any mixture of imperfection *virtually*.—(*c*) From His *supreme dominion*. "He doth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth;" Dan. iv. 35. He "worketh all things after the counsel of His own will;" Eph. i. 11. If there were more supreme Governors of the world than One, each absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the same thing; than which nothing can be more prejudicial to government. God is a

35. How does it appear that the *Unity* of God is as necessary as His *Existence*? Quote texts in reference to the subject.

God of order, therefore of unity. If it be better that the universe should be governed by One than by many, it surely is so; for nothing must be conceived of God but what is best. He therefore who made all things by that right is Lord of all; and because all power is His, He *alone* ruleth over all.

36. God is not only *One*, but hath a *peculiar Unity*, by which He is the *Only* God, not only *actual* but *possible*. (*a'*) Every *individual man* is *one*, but so as *there are others*. (*a''*) *The Sun* indeed is *one*, so as there *is not another*, at least within the same vortex, but there *might have been*. (*b*) Whereas in the *Divine Nature* there is an *intrinsical and essential singularity*, because no other being can have any existence but from that; and whatsoever essence hath its existence from another is not God. "I am the Lord, and there is none else, &c." Isai. xlv. 5, 6.—"Is there a God beside Me?.....I know not any;" Isai. xliv. 8.—"This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God;" John xvii. 3.

Practical uses of Belief in the Unity *of God.*

37. This belief is necessary, (*a*) In respect of ourselves who are obliged to worship Him: lest our minds should in our worship fluctuate about various and uncertain objects. Among more Gods than one, not differing, since all by nature Gods, what inclination or reason could we have to prefer or elect *any one* for the object of our devotion? (*b*) In respect of Him who is to be worshipped. Without this acknowledgment we cannot give unto God the things which are God's, it being part of His due honour to accept of no compartner. "Thou shalt have no other Gods before Me;" Exod. xx. 3.—"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve;" Matt iv. 10. because He alone is God: Him only shalt thou fear, because He alone is

---

36. In what respect is the *Unity* of God *peculiar*, and different from any other unity? Quote texts. 37. What are the practical uses of Belief in the *Unity* of God?

infinitely powerful: in Him only shalt thou trust, because "He only is our Rock and our Salvation;" Psal. lxii. 2. to Him alone shalt thou direct thy devotions, because "He only knoweth the hearts of the children of men;" 2 Chron. vi. 30. "The Lord our God is one God; and (rather *therefore*) thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, &c." Deut. vi. 4, 5. Whosoever were truly and by nature God must claim our love on the ground of infinite excellency: if then there were more Gods than one, our love must be terminated unto more than one, and consequently divided between them, as also the proper effect thereof, our ready obedience; which when divided is destroyed; "No man can serve two Masters: &c." Matt. vi. 24.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. I. §. 2.

38. A. Since as by all things created is made known the "eternal power and Godhead," and the dependency of all limited beings infers an infinite and independent essence; since all things are for some end, and all their operations directed to it, though they cannot apprehend that end, and therefore must be guided by some universal and overruling Wisdom: since this inference is so evident that all nations have made it; since moreover God hath made frequent patefactions of His Deity by infallible predictions and supernatural operations, [and hath made conscience within us a witness of Himself;*] therefore I assent to and profess this truth, that *There is a God.*—B. Again, since a prime and independent Being supposeth all other to depend, and consequently no other to be God; since the entire fountain of all perfection is incapable of a double head, and the most perfect government of the universe speaks the supreme dominion of one absolute Lord; therefore I acknowledge that God to be but *One*, and in this Unity or rather singularity of the Godhead, excluding all actual or possible multiplication of the Deity, *I believe in* GOD.

ART. I. §. 3. I BELIEVE IN GOD THE FATHER.

39. I. As *our* Father. II. As the Father of *Jesus Christ.*

---

38. Give a summary of truths confessed in the affirmation, *I believe in God.* 39. What are the principal senses in which we believe in God as *the Father*?

* This argument, though previously used (par. 32.) by Pearson, he has here omitted. *G.*

40. I. As *our* Father.—Though the *Christian* notion of the Divine Paternity be somewhat peculiar, yet God wheresoever acknowledged hath been understood and worshipped as a *Father:* the very heathen poets so describe their gods, and their vulgar names include such a notion.

41. The proper foundation of *Paternity* is *Generation.* As therefore the phrase of generation is diversely attributed to several acts of the same nature with generation properly taken, or by consequence attending on it, so the title of Father is given to divers persons and things, and for several reasons to the same God.

42. On account of (*a*) *Creation.* "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created;" Gen. ii. 4. So that the creation of any thing is a kind of generation, consequently the Creator a kind of Father.—"Hath the rain a Father?" Job xxxviii. 28. implying that God as the only assignable cause of it may be called its Father.—"To us there is but one God, the *Father*, of whom are all things;" 1 Cor. viii. 6. But of this mass of creatures some more properly call Him Father. Of merely natural beings and irrational agents, He is the Creator; of rational and intellectual the Father also. Hence He is styled "The Father of Spirits;" Heb. xii. 9.—the blessed Angels, "the sons of God;" Job xxxviii. 7. Man, "His offspring;" Acts xvii. 28. and Adam, "the son of God;" Luke iii. 38. "Have

---

40. In what character has God, wheresoever acknowledged, been understood and worshipped? 41. What is the proper foundation of *Paternity?* Is the phrase of *generation* always used in its *proper* sense? If not, how do its various senses influence the latitude of the application of the term *Father?* 42. On what accounts is the name of *Father*, in the sense of the term *now* under consideration, given to God? By which of His creatures is He more

we not all" then "one *Father?* hath not one God *created* us?" Malac. ii. 10.—To creation is annexed *conservation*, by which God preserves in being that to which he gave being. As the educating and preserving the child by the parent gives the name of *Father* to *man*, so does conservation to *God.*—(*b*) *Temporal Redemption.* Redemption from a state of misery to a happy condition is a kind of *generation*, which, joined with love and care on the part of the Redeemer, gives him another title of *Father.* Well might Moses tell the Israelites, "Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee? &c." Deut. xxxii. 6., well might God speak to the same people as to His son, even His first-born; Exod. iv. 22.—"Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and He that formed thee from the womb;" Isai. xliv. 24.—Justly did they acknowledge, "Doubtless thou art our Father, &c." Isai. lxiii. 16.—(*c*) *Spiritual Regeneration.* "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;" John iii. 3. A double birth there is,.....and though the *dispensers* of the incorruptible seed, *i.e.* the word of God, may in *some* sense say, "I have begotten you through the Gospel," 1 Cor. iv. 15., yet *He* is the *true Father*, whose word it is, even God, who "of His own will begat us with the word of truth;" James i. 18. Thus "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God;" 1 John v. 1., which *Regeneration* is as it were a *second creation:* for "we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works;" Eph. ii. 10. He alone who created us out of nothing can beget us again, and make us of the new creation.—(*d*) *Regeneration to glory.* Our

---

properly called Father as well as Creator? Quote texts in support and illustration of the reasons assigned for styling God our Father.

Saviour puts us in mind of "the Regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory;" Matt. xix. 28. The resurrection of our bodies is a kind of coming out of the womb of the earth; and entering on immortality a nativity into another life. "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, &c. are the sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection;" Luke xx. 35, 36. (See also Rom. viii. 17; Col. iii. 24; Heb. ix. 15; 1 John iii. 2.)—"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who....hath begotten us again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; &c." 1 Pet. i. 3, 4.—(*e*) *Adoption.* The Laws have found a way by which a man may become a father without procreation; and this imitation of nature is called *Adoption.* God, though many other ways a Father, hath made us sons by *this* also. And this *He* doth, *not* like *human* adopters, for His own, but for our sakes: "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God;" 1 John iii. 1., that we, the sons of disobedient and condemned Adam by natural generation, should be translated into the glorious liberty of the sons of God! (See also Eph. iii. 15; i. 18.) He hath "predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself," Eph. i. 5., and so we receive "the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father!" Rom. viii. 15.

Practical uses of Belief in God as our Father.

43. This belief is necessary, (*a*) Because it is the ground of all our filial fear, honour, and obedience due unto Him. "Honour thy Father is the first commandment with promise," Eph. vi. 2. written with the finger of God.—"Children, obey your parents in the Lord,"

---

43. What are the practical uses of belief in God as *our Father?*

Eph, vi. 1. is an Evangelical precept, but founded on principles of reason and justice; "for this is right." If such be our duty to the "Fathers of our *flesh*," much more is it to our Heavenly Father. "A son honoureth his father, &c.?" Mal. i. 6. If His sons, we must be brethren to the only-begotten; but He, who came not to do His own will, but the will of Him who sent him, hath said, "Whosoever shall do the will of My Father which is in heaven, the same is My brother;" Matt. xii. 50. —(*b*) Because it is the life of our devotions. Christ, teaching how to pray, propounded not the *knowledge* of God, nor represented His *power*, but comprehended all in his *Paternity*; "When ye pray, say our Father;" Luke xi. 2. This prevents all *vain repetition*;—"our Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask Him;" Matt. vi. 8. and assures us of a grant without mistake of our petition. "What *man* is there of us, who, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?.....If we then who are evil know how to give good gifts to our children, how much more shall our Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?" Matt. vii. 9. &c.—(*c*) Because it is the proper foundation of our Christian patience, and even rejoicing in the greatest sufferings. "We have had fathers of our flesh, which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live?" Heb. xii. 9, 10., especially when "they chastened us after their own pleasure, but He for our profit, &c."—"Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." —"As a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee:" Deut. viii. 5. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him;" Psal. ciii. 13.—(*d*) Because the Paternity of God infers the necessity of our imitation of Him. The general notion of generation is the production of the like; a production partly consisting in essentials, or the likeness of nature, partly in accidentals, or likeness in figure or affections. "Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image;" Gen. v. 3. "Be ye followers (rather *imitators*) of God, as dear children;" Eph. v. 1. God commanded the children of Israel, whom He styled His son, "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy;" Lev. xi. 44. and elsewhere. The Apostle speaks to us as obedient children, "As He that hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation;" 1 Pet. i. 15. Christ hath commanded us, "Love your enemies, &c. that ye

may be the children of your Father which is in heaven, &c." Matt. v. 44, 45. "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father is merciful." Luke vi. 34.

44. II. As the Father of *Jesus Christ:* the principal and most proper explication of God's Paternity. As we find one person in a more peculiar manner the Son of God, so we must look on God as in a more peculiar manner the Father of that Son. "I ascend unto my Father and your Father" John xx. 17. saith our Saviour, or more strictly translated, (see original,) "unto the Father of Me and Father of you," ours because His. So far are we the sons of God as we are like unto Him by conformity to the likeness of His Son. "For whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren;" Rom. viii. 29. "God sent forth His Son that we might receive the adoption of sons;" and "because we are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father;" Gal. iv. 4. &c. But though "He that sanctifieth," Christ, "and they who are sanctified," faithful Christians, "are all of one," the same Father, the same God, "for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren;" Heb. ii. 11., yet are they not all of Him after the same manner, but Christ the Son after a more peculiar and excellent manner; the rest with relation to and dependence on *His* Sonship: "as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God;" John i. 12. The disparity being so great in the filiation must be as great in the corresponding relation. i. There

---

44. What is the principal and most proper explication of God's *Paternity?* How far are we (in a Christian sense of the term) the sons of God? Quote relevant texts. According to what degree of filiation may *all* men, according to what higher degrees may *some* men, be accounted

is one degree of Sonship, founded on Creation, the lowest, as belonging to all, good and bad: ii. another, higher, grounded on Regeneration and Adoption, belonging only to the faithful in this life; iii. a third above the rest, founded on the Resurrection, or collation to the eternal inheritance, and the similitude of God, belonging to the saints alone in the world to come. iv. And there is yet another, of a greater eminency and different nature, appertaining to the true Son of God alone, who amongst all his brethren hath only received the title of "*His own Son*;" Rom. viii. 32. and a testimony from heaven, "This is my *beloved* Son;" Matt. iii. 17. and xvii. 5. even in the presence of John the Baptist, even in the midst of Moses and Elias (sons of God by all the other three degrees of filiation,) and therefore hath called God peculiarly "*His own Father*" (πατέρα ἴδιον); John v. 18. So at last we come to the most singular and eminent paternal relation, unto "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;" 2 Cor. xi. 31. Christ hath taught *us* to say "*Our Father*:" *He* sometimes calls Him "*the Father*," sometimes "*My Father*," sometimes "*your*," but never "*our*;" He so conjoins us to Himself as to distinguish, though He so distinguishes as not to separate us.

45. This most eminent notion of God's Paternity appears to be the original and proper explication of this Article; not only because the only one delivered by the ancient Fathers, but also because required by the occasion and rise of the Creed

---

sons of God? Who is the true and proper Son of God by a far higher degree and kind of filiation than all these? Quote texts, illustrating His pre-eminency and the distinction between Him and us, whom He calls His brethren.

45. How does it appear that the pre-eminent notion of God's Paternity as Father of Jesus Christ is the original

itself. According to the sacred form of Baptism delivered by Christ at His ascension, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," the Church required a corresponding profession of Belief before persons could be baptized in their name. In the Acts of the Apostles no more is expressed than baptism in the name of *Christ;* Acts ii. 38; viii. 16. &c. and so no more is expressed of the requisite Faith than belief in the same name. But since the Father and the Holy Ghost were likewise mentioned in the first institution, since the expressing of one excludes not the other, and since from the Apostles' times the names of all three were certainly used, hence on the same ground was required faith and profession of belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Again, as the Eunuch (Acts viii.) said not simply, "I believe in the Son," but "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," as a brief explication of what he had learned of Philip, so the converts to Christianity were first taught not the bare names, but brief and familiar explications of them, which when they had rendered and professed, they were baptized in them. And these being constantly used made up the Rule of Faith, *i.e.* the Creed, which the Church from the first age to the present has delivered to those who were to be baptized, and required of them or their sureties a profession of it. In whatever sense

---

and proper explication of this Article of the Creed? In what name is Baptism said in the Acts of the Apostles to be administered? Why does it not follow that that name *only* was used? In what sense must the name of Father be taken in the form of Baptism? Why so there? and therefore here?

therefore the name of *Father* is taken in the form of baptism it must be taken in this Article. And since in that form *Father* can have no other relation but to *that Son* whose name is joined with His, and since we are baptized into *no other Son* of that *Father* but the only-begotten Jesus Christ, into *no other Father* than the Father of that only-begotten, therefore the proper explication of the first words of the Creed is, "I believe in God the *Father* of *Christ Jesus.*"

46. Vainly then is that vulgar distinction *here* applied whereby the Father is considered, not only *personally*, but *essentially*, as comprehending the *whole* Trinity. For that the Son is not here comprehended in the Father is evident not only from the occasion, but from the very letter of the Creed,– "in God the Father, and in His Son" –where the first-mentioned person must manifestly be understood to be the Father of the second.

47. God may several ways be called the Father of Christ;—1. As he was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary;—2. As He was sent by Him with special authority as the king of Israel;—3. As He was raised from the dead and made heir of all things:—but beside all these, God is the Father of that Son, 4. in a more eminent and peculiar manner, as He is, and ever was, with God, and God: [*v. infra, Art.* II.]. And according to this Paternity by generation totally Divine we believe in God as the eternal Father of an eternal Son; as always God, so always Father, and that in a far more proper manner than any Creature.—For (*a*) The condition of *human* generation, and of the relations thence arising, is so fluctuating that the same person now a son may become a father, and

---

46. Why must the *Father* be here considered *personally*, not *inclusively*, as He sometimes is, of the whole Trinity?

47. In what ways may God be called the Father of Christ?

then cease to be either son or father, losing both relations by death: whereas in the Godhead these relations are fixed, the Father having never been a Son, the Son never becoming a Father.—And (*b*) God hath begotten a Son of the same nature and essence with Himself, not only *specifically*, but *individually* (*v. Art.* II.). If *man* begetteth a son "in his own likeness, after his own image;" Gen. v. 3. *i.e.* of the same nature, of the same substance with himself, and thus obtaineth the name of Father, because of the similitude of *his* nature—with which similarity many accidental disparities may consist—in the son, how much more proper is the name to *God* Himself, who hath begotten a Son of a nature and essence the perfect identity whereof admits no disparity?

48. The privilege or priority of the proper and eternal *Father* of His own eternal *Son* in regard to that relation consists not in this, that the essence or attributes of the one are greater than the essence or attributes of the other; they are the same in both; but only in this, that the Father hath that essence of Himself; the Son by communication from the Father. Whence He acknowledgeth that He is "from Him;" John vii. 29—"liveth by Him;" John vi. 57.—that "the Father gave Him to have life in Himself," v. 26.—and generally referreth all things to Him as received from Him. Wherefore some of the ancients scrupled not to interpret "The Father is

---

Why is Paternity far more properly predicated of God as the Father of Christ than of any human Father in regard of *his* Son? 48. In what does the priority of the Father in regard to the Son consist? Quote texts. "My Father is greater than I;" John xiv. 28. Some of the ancients interpreted this of Christ as the Second person of the

greater than I," John xiv. 28. of Christ as the Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, but still not as to His *essence* but His *generation*. "I can of mine own self do nothing;" John v. 30, saith Christ; because He is not of Himself; and whosoever receives His *being* must receive His *power* from another, especially where the essence and power are, as in God, the same. The Son then "can do nothing of Himself but what He seeth the Father do;" John v. 19. yet, since the Father gave Him *all* power, as communicating His entire essence, "what things soever the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise." Life is in God *originally*, in the creatures *derivatively*: and "as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself;" John v. 26. both the *same* life, both *in themselves*, both in the *same degree*, only that the Father *giveth* it, the Son *receiveth* it: "the living Father sent Him, and He liveth by the Father." John vi. 57.—The pre-eminence then of the Father is that He is God not of any other but of Himself, and that there is no other person who is God but is God of Him. The Father is a *Father* indeed by reason of His *Son*, but *not God* by reason of Him; The Son is not only *Son* but *God* by reason of the *Father*.

49. On this pre-eminence rests the congruity of the Divine *Mission*. We often read that Christ was *sent*, whence named an *Apostle* (Heb. iii. 1.) Himself, as well as those whom He so named because "as the Father sent Him, so sent He them;" John xx. 21. The Holy Ghost is also said to be *sent*, sometimes by the Father, some-

---

Trinity; but with reference to what? The Father hath life in Himself; the Son hath life in Himself: in what respects equally, and with what only difference? 49. On

times by the Son: but we never read that the *Father* was *sent*, there being an authority in that name inconsistent with this mission. In the parable of the Householder who planted a vineyard, &c. and last of all sent to the husbandmen his son, Matt. xxi. 33., &c., it had been inconsistent even with the *literal* sense, as not consonant to the rational customs of *men*, to have said that the son sent his father; so God, placing man in the vineyard of His Church, first sent His servants the prophets, but in the last days His *Son:* it were as inconsistent with the *Divine* generation that the Son should send the Father. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father;" John vi. 57. saith Christ. He which begetteth sendeth, and He which is begotten is sent. "For I am from Him, and He hath sent Me;" vii. 29. He then is that "God who sent forth His Son made of a woman;" Gal. iv. 4. who "hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, &c." So that this authority of sending is in the Father: which ought to be acknowledged, because this mission affords the highest testimony of His love to man: "Herein is love....He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins:" 1 John iv. 10.

50. The dignity of the Father further appears from the order of the persons in the Trinity, of which He is undoubtedly the first. For though sometimes the Son may first be named, as in "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c." 2 Cor. xiii. 14, and sometimes the Holy Ghost precede the

---

what do we justly ground the congruity of the Divine *Mission*? How does the Father differ from the Son and the Holy Ghost with regard to Mission? Quote texts. How has the Father, in reference to Mission, especially manifested His love to man? 50. How does the dignity of the Father

Son, as in "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit, &c." 1 Cor. xii. 4. &c., yet where the Three Persons are barely enumerated and delivered as the Rule of Faith, there their proper order is observed; witness the form of Baptism "in the name of the Father, &c." an order perpetuated in all confessions of faith, and inviolably to be observed, as founded in the nature of things themselves. The Son must necessarily be second to the Father, from whom He receiveth His origination, and the Holy Ghost to the Son. The ancient Fathers (*passim*) scruple not to call the Father the origin, the cause, author, root, fountain, head, of the Son, or the whole Divinity; making this difference between the person of the Father and the person of the Son, that as the branch is from the root, &c. whereas the root receives nothing from the branch, &c. so the Son is from the Father, receiving His subsistence by generation from Him; the Father not from the Son, being what He is from none.

51. Some of the ancients may seem to have carrried the distinction yet further; as if because the Son had not His essence from Himself, the Father *had*, &c. whereas, properly speaking, the Father had neither His being from another, (which were repugnant to His paternity,) nor from Himself, (which is a contradiction:) therefore those expressions are not to be understood *positively* and *affirmatively*, but *negatively* and *exclusively*, that He hath His essence from none, &c. So that the proper notion of the Father is, that He is a Person subsisting eternally in one infinite essence of the Godhead, which essence, not received by Him from

---

appear from the order of Persons in the Trinity? what is that order? on what founded? Is it invariably observed whenever the Three Persons are referred to in the same Scripture passage? Quote texts. If not, what occasions are there on which it is and must be strictly observed? How did the ancient fathers speak of the Father as the fountain of the Son or of the whole Deity? And why did they make this distinction in regard of the Father? 51. Some of them may seem to have made such a distinction

any other Person, he hath communicated by generation to another Person, who thereby is the Son.

52. The name of *God* taken *absolutely* is often in Scripture spoken of the Father; as when we read of "God sending his own Son;"—of "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God;" and generally wheresoever Christ is called the Son of God, the name of *God* is to be taken particularly for the *Father*, because Christ is no Son but of the Father. See 1 Cor. viii. 6.; Eph. iv. 6.; 1 Thess. i. 9.; 2 Cor. i. 3.; Eph. i. 3.

Practical uses of Belief in God as the Father *of* Jesus Christ [*and fountain of the whole Divinity*].

53. This belief is necessary (*a*) For the avoiding plurality of gods. For if there were more than one which were from none, there were more gods than one. The Son and Holy Ghost have been believed to be but one God with the Father, because both from the Father, who is One, and so the union of them.—(*b*) Because there is no other notion under which we, fallen from God, can be brought to God again so as to be saved, but the notion of the *Father;* and none can bring us to the Father but the Son of that Father: for "through Him we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father;" Eph. ii. 18.

Summary of Truths Confessed in Art. I. §. 3.

54. As I am assured that there is an infinite and independent Being, which we call *a God*, and that there cannot be more infinities than one, so I assure myself

---

as if because the Son had *not* His essence *from Himself*, the Father *had:* but shew how their expressions in such a case are rightly to be understood. 52. The name of *God* taken absolutely is often in Scripture used of the *Father:* give instances. 53. What are the practical uses of belief in God as the *Father of Jesus Christ* [and fountain of the whole Divinity]? 54. Give a summary of the truths confessed by him who affirms his belief *in God the Father.*

that this One God is the *Father* of all things, especially of all men and angels, so far as creation may be styled generation; that He is further yet and more peculiarly the Father of all those whom He regenerateth by His Spirit, adopteth in His Son as co-heirs with Him, and rewardeth with an eternal inheritance in the heavens. But far above all this, I believe Him the Father, more eminently and transcendently, of one singular and proper Son, His own, beloved, only-begotten, Son; whom He hath not only begotten of the blessed Virgin by the coming of the Holy Ghost and the over-shadowing of His power; not only sent with special authority as the king of Israel; not only raised from the dead, and made heir of all things; but antecedently to all this hath begotten Him by way of eternal generation in the same Divinity with Himself: by which Paternity I acknowledge Him always Father as much as always God. And in this relation I profess that eminency and priority, that as He is the original cause of all things as created by Him, so is He the fountain of the Son begotten by Him, and of the Holy Ghost proceeding from Him. Thus *I believe in God the* FATHER.

ART. I. §. 4. THE FATHER ALMIGHTY.

55. The notion of *Almighty* in the Creed must be interpreted according to the sense of the original word in the New Testament, a sense best understood through the Greek writers or interpreters of the Old Testament. The word which we translate *Almighty*, παντοκράτωρ, the most ancient Greek interpreters used A. sometimes for the title of God, *the Lord of Hosts*, B. sometimes for His name *Shaddai*, (as generally in Job.) A. By the first they seem to signify the *dominion* which God hath over all; B. by the second the *power* by which He can perform

---

55. How is the notion of *Almighty* in the Creed to be interpreted? To what two Hebrew appellations of God does the word here used correspond according to the usage of the ancient Greek interpreters? and what do they appear to have taken to be the force of the Hebrew terms? On what

all things. A. "The heavens and the earth were finished, &c." Gen. ii. 1.; and He which began and finished them is the Ruler and Commander of them. "I have made the earth, &c., My hands have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded;" Isai. xlv. 12. And on this dominion or command, justly challenged on the right of creation, He raises the title of the *Lord of Hosts*, (Κύριος Σαβαώθ,) preserved in the original language by St Paul and St James, but turned by St John into the word which we translate *Almighty*. Wherefore from the use of the sacred writers, the notation of the word in Greek, and the testimony of the ancient Fathers, we may well in this Article ascribe to God the Father the dominion over all, and the rule and government of all.

56. This authority or power, properly *potestative*, of God, may be divided into three branches:

57. I. A right of *making* and framing any thing which He willeth, in any manner as it pleaseth Him. This head is mentioned only for the necessity of it, and the dependence of the other two upon it: God's actual dominion necessarily supposing precedent creation, for nothing before it exists can belong to any one.

58. II. A right of *having* and possessing all things so made and framed by Him, as His own, properly belonging to him, as their Lord and Master, by virtue of direct dominion. This right is (*a*) *Independent;* both 1. In the *original* of it; for God hath received no authority from any, because He hath all power originally in Himself, and hath produced all things by the act of His own will alone;

---

authorities and testimonies do we in this article ascribe to God the Father universal dominion and government? 56–59. Into what branches may the power *authoritative* in this Article ascribed to God be divided? 57. Why must a right of *creation* be *first* mentioned in treating of this subject? 58. In what respects, and wherefore, is

and 2. In the *exercise* of it, as being liable to no direction by, nor responsibility to, any other; being illimited, absolute, supreme, and so the fountain whence all dominion in any other is derived. Wherefore He, being the "God of Gods," is also the "Lord of lords and King of kings," the "*only Potentate.*" 1 Tim. vi. 15. (*b*) *Infinite:* 1. In *amplitude* of *object;* the Almighty is "Lord of heaven," "Lord of the whole earth," "Lord of heaven and earth," *i. e.* of all things both in heaven and earth. See also Deut. x. 14. Psal. lxxxix. 11. And, "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, &c: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Thine. Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, &c. and Thou reignest over all;" 1 Chron. xxix. 11, 12. Nothing can be imagined which is not His, belonging to Him as the true owner and proprietor, and subject wholly to His will, as the sole governor and disposer. 2. In *plenitude* of *manner;* as in regard of the *extension* He hath *power*, so in regard of the *intension* He hath *all power* over all things. "O house of Israel,...as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in My hand;" Jer. xviii. 6. *i. e.* God hath as absolute power and dominion over every person, nation, kingdom, on the earth, as the potter over the pot he makes or the clay he moulds. Thus are we wholly at the disposal of His will, and our present and future condition framed and ordered by His free, but wise and just, decrees. "Hath not the potter power over the clay, &c." Rom. ix. 21. 3. In *length* of *duration;* eternal, if any thing be immortal. For since every thing is His because it received its being from Him, and since its continuation is as much from Him, as its first production; therefore as long as it is

---

God's right of *possessing* all things both *independent* and *infinite?* Quote texts.

continued it must be His: and consequently, since some of His creatures are immortal, His dominion must be eternal. Wherefore St Paul calls Him "the King eternal," 1 Tim. i. 17; referring to "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, &c." Psal. cxlv. 13. So Moses, "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever;" Exod. xv. 18, where the original phrase signifies that there is no time to come assignable or imaginable, but after and beyond that God shall reign.

59. III. A right to the *use* of all things in His possession, by virtue of His absolute dominion. According to reason the use and benefit of any thing redounds to its proprietor. God indeed, all-sufficient and infinitely happy in and of Himself, cannot receive any real benefit from the creature. "Thou art my Lord, my goodness extendeth not to Thee," Psal. xvi. 2.; therefore our only and absolute Lord, because His goodness extendeth unto us, and not ours to him, because His dominion is for our benefit, not for His own. But He hath made all things, though for the benefit of some of His creatures, yet ultimately for Himself. Not only "of Him," and "by Him," as the first Author, but also "*to Him*," and "*for Him*," as the ultimate end, "*are all things*," "The Lord hath made all things for Himself, &c." Prov. xvi. 4. For though He cannot receive any real benefit or utility from the creature, yet He can and doth receive what has some similitude or affinity with it. Thus God "*rejoiceth*," Psal. civ. 31., at the effects of His wisdom, power, and goodness, and taketh delight in the works of His

59. On what is God's right to the *use* of all things founded? For whose benefit hath He made all things? For whom *ultimately*? God cannot receive any real benefit from His creatures, yet can and does receive what has some *similitude* with it: How?

hands. Thus doth He order and dispose of all things to His own glory, which redounds from the demonstration of His attributes.

Practical uses of belief in the Almighty.

60. This belief is necessary (*a*) To breed in us an awful reverence of His Majesty, and entire subjection to His will. For if God be our absolute Lord, we His servants and vassals, there is a right in Him to require whatsoever we can perform, an obligation on us to perform whatsoever He commands. "Why call ye Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke vi. 46. (*b*) To breed in us equanimity and patience, to prevent all murmuring and objecting against the actions or determinations of God, as knowing that He, absolute Lord, cannot abuse His power, He, whose will is a law to us, cannot do any thing unwisely or unjustly....."Shall the clay say to Him that fashioneth it, what makest Thou?" Isai. xlv. 9. "I was dumb and opened not my mouth, because Thou didst it;" Psal. xxxix. 9. (*c*) To make us truly and sufficiently sensible of the benefits we receive from Him. No man can duly prize the blessings of heaven but he who acknowledgeth they might justly have been denied him; nor be sufficiently thankful for them unless confessing that the Bestower owed him nothing.

61. The original word for *Almighty* is not only put A. for the *Lord of Hosts*, a title denoting *dominion, authoritative* power; but also B. for *Shaddai*, a name implying infinity of *active* and *executive* power; for whether we take this word in composition (שׁ for אשׁר *who*, and די *sufficient*), as signifying the *All-sufficient*, whosoever can supply all things to the sufficing of all must have an infinite power; or whether we derive it from the root (שׁדד to *destroy*) denoting *destruction*, whosoever can reduce all things to nothing, must have the same infinite power which produced them out of nothing. Howsoever, the first

---

60. What are the practical uses of belief in *the Almighty*? Quote texts. 61. What are the derivations proposed for the divine name *Shaddai*? How does it appear that the *second* notion of *Almighty* (implied in this term) is necessarily inferred from the *first*? [*See par.* 55.] How does the dominion

notion of *Almighty* necessarily infers the second; infinity of dominion implies infinite power in operation. Indeed, in *earthly* dominions the strength of the governor is not in himself, but in those whom he governeth: but the King of Kings hath in Himself all power of execution as well as right of dominion.....If His dominion be uncontrollable, it is because His power is irresistible. In respect of which infinity and irristibility of *active* power, we must acknowledge Him *Almighty*. But this second explication of His Omnipotency will be fully given under Art. VI. where it is most peculiarly expressed, in the Greek word παντοδύναμος there used for *Almighty*, which is different from this in Art. I., though the English and Latin make no such distinction.

62. Two other interpretations of Almighty (παντοκράτωρ) made by some of the ancients, belong rather to philosophy than divinity, though true in both.—(*a*) Holding, containing, and comprehending, all things. "Who hath gathered the wind in His fists? &c." Prov. xxx. 4. "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, &c." Isai. xl. 12.—(*b*) Sustaining or preserving all things. "God giveth to all life and breath and all things. In Him we live and move and have our being;" Acts xvii. 25, 28. "Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone; Thou hast made heaven, &c., the earth and all things that are therein, &c., and Thou preservest them all;" Nehem. ix. 6. Where the continual conservation of the creature is equally attributed to God with their first production; because equally necessary.

Summary of truths confessed in ART. 1. §. 4.

63. As I am persuaded of an infinite and independent essence, which I term a God, and of the mystery of an eternal generation by which that God is a Father, so I assure myself that Father is not subject to infirmity

---

of God differ from that of earthly rulers? The term *Almighty* in the sense of *active* power will come under special consideration hereafter in Art. VI. Why? 62. What two other interpretations of *Almighty* are mentioned by Pearson? Shew that they are true as regards the *facts* implied by them. 63. Give a summary of truths confessed

nor weakness: on the contrary I believe *Omnipotency* to be an essential attribute of His Deity, not only in respect of *operative* and *outer* power, concerning which I shall express my faith hereafter, but also of power *authoritative*, in which I must acknowledge His antecedent and eternal right of making what and when and how He pleased, of possessing by direct dominion whatsoever he maketh, of using and disposing as He pleaseth all things which He so possesseth. This dominion I believe to *most absolutely Independent* both in its *original* and *exercise*: *de Jure*: for *magnitude*, as being a power over all things without exception: for *plenitude*, as being all power without limit over every thing: for *duration*, as being eternal. Thus *I believe in God the Father* ALMIGHTY.

ART. I. §. 5. MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH.

64. This clause was not expressed in the ancient Creeds; the sense thereof was however delivered in the first rules of Faith, and at last these particular words inserted both in the Greek and Latin confessions. For its full explication it is required:

65. I. To declare the latitude of the object, what is comprehended under the terms of "heaven and earth." Under them are here comprehended all things: the first rules of Faith did so express it, and the most ancient Creeds had,—either instead of or together with these words,—"the maker of all things visible and invisible," terms comprehending every thing imaginable. Since then

---

by him who affirms his belief in *God the Father Almighty*. 61. Was the last clause of Art. I. *expressed* in the *ancient* Creeds? 64, 65, 72, 86. What is required for its full explication? 65. What is comprehended under the terms "heaven and earth?" What words were used to express the same meaning in the *Nicene* Creed? And from the expression there used, and the addition of "heaven and earth" made to it in the *Constantinopolitan* Creed, shew that the Latin Church using in the Apostles' Creed only this last expression must have taken it in the same extent of meaning as the words of the Nicene Creed. [*Note.* The Nicene Creed

these were the words of the *Nicene Creed*, since the addition of "heaven and earth" in the *Constantinopolitan* could be no diminution of the former, which they still retained together with them, saying....."maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;" it follows that they who in the Latin Church made use only of this last addition must have taken it in the fulness of the first expression.

66. Well may this be taken as the sense of the Creed, being the known language of Scripture. "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth;" Exod. xxxi. 17,—"made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is;" Exod. xx. 11. So that by those two must be understood all things contained in them: and we know no being made or placed without them. When God would make up an universal auditory, the prophet cries, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth!" Isai. i. 2. When He would express the utmost extent of His dominion, "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool;" Isai. lxvi. 1. Claiming Immensity and Omnipresence,

---

of our Communion Service is *mainly* the Constantinopolitan. "The Western Church uses the Creed of Constantinople with these three differences, 1. She has restored the Nicene expression "God of God." 2. She has rendered the expression "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost *and* the Virgin Mary" by "was incarnate *by* (de) the Holy Ghost *of* (ex) the Virgin Mary." (*see par.* 203.) 3. She has expressed the full and whole truth upon the subject by adding to the words "who proceedeth from the Father" the additional words "and the Son." (*See par.* 471) Bp. Forbes, Exp. of the Nicene Creed. p. 12. (a quotation obligingly communicated to me by the Rev. G. H. Ainger, late Principal of St Bees' College.) See many particulars respecting ancient Creeds in Bingham's Eccl. Antiqq. Book X. chaps. 3, 4. —*C.*] 66. Shew the sense of the clause now under consideration from texts of Scripture. Especially

"Do I not fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord;" Jer. xxiii. 24. These two together then signify the Universe, or what is called the World. St. Paul hath given a clear exposition of these words: "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands;" Acts xvii. 24. For since God is necessarily the Lord of all things which He made, "*heaven and earth*" must be equivalent to "the world and all things therein." Where the Apostle has conjoined the speech of both Testaments. For the ancient Hebrews seem to have had no *single* word to express *the world*, as the Greeks had, (in whose language St Paul spoke,) and therefore used in conjunction "*the heaven and the earth*" as the grand extremities within which all things are contained. And in the Rabbinical division of the Universe into *three* worlds, the *inferior* is wholly contained in the name *earth*, the *superior* and *middle* under the name *heaven*. The *Greeks* too themselves use this manner of expression, not only before but after Pythagoras had accustomed them to one name. Therefore, as under the single name or World or Universe, so under the conjunctive expression of "Heaven and Earth," are contained all things, material and immaterial, visible and invisible.

67. All beings then whatsoever were made; God Himself manifestly excepted, who made all things; compare "When he saith all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted which did put &c." 1 Cor. xv. 27. We read concerning the Word, "the world was made by Him;" John i. 10. "all things were made by Him;" i. 3. which is further illustrated thus, "By Him were all things

---

apply "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, &c.;" Acts xvii. 24. illustrating this language by reference to the manner in which Hebrew writers, Biblical and Rabbinical, express the *World* or Universe, as also to usages of Greek writers. 67. What necessary exception do we make when we say that all things are made? Give a Scripture illustration of a similarly elliptical expression. Quote texts shewing the

created that are in heaven and that are in earth visible and invisible, &c." Col. i. 16. Nothing then being imaginable which is not either in heaven or earth, neither visible nor invisible, there is therefore nothing beside God which was not made by God.

68. As "every house is builded by some man;" Heb. iii. 4. for we see the earth bear no such creature of itself; stones donot grow into a wall, &c. these are not the works of nature, but..... testimonies of the understanding of Man, the great Artificer on earth; So if the World itself be but a house, &c. the habitation of an infinite Intelligence, the Temple of God, then must we acknowledge the world was built by Him, and therefore that "He which built all things is God;" Heb. iii. 4.

69. Whatsoever hath any being is either made or not made: whatsoever is not made is God; whatsoever is not God is made. One independent, uncreated, essence; all others depending on, and created by, it: One of eternal and necessary existence; all others indifferent either to be or not to be, and that indifferency determined only by the free and voluntary act of the first Cause.

70. Now since to be thus made includes some imperfection, and among the parts of the world some are more glorious than others, if the most perfect pre-suppose a Maker, much more do those which are far less perfect. This house of God, though uniform, is not all of the same materials; &c. This first aerial heaven, where God "maketh the

---

universality of creation. 68. "Every house is builded by some man;" Heb. iii. 4. Apply a similar argument in reference to the World. 69. Whatsoever hath any being is either made or not made. Contrast the *made* with the *Not Made*. 70. From the creation of angels and heaven derive an argument for the universality of creation.

clouds His chariot, &c." Psal. civ. 3. is not so inferior in place as in glory to the second, the seat of the sun and moon, &c. which is not so far above the first as beneath the third, into which St Paul was caught: the *proper habitation* of the blessed angels which constantly attend the throne. Now the angels being termed "sons of God" are manifestly from Him, not of themselves:—and since God hath but one proper and Only-begotten Son, as being of the same increated essence with the Father, all other offspring must be *made*, consequently even the angels *created* sons. The passage, "Who maketh His angels spirits, &c." Psal. civ. 4. though rather as first spoken referring to wind and lightning, yet is applied Heb. i. to the angels properly so called. If then those glorious and happy spirits, those "sons of God" which "shouted for joy" when "the foundations of the earth were laid;" Job xxxviii. 7, 4. if they and their habitations, the far most eminent parts of the world, were *made*, much more were all inferior things; consequently *all things* beside that One who made them.

71. This then is the first part of our Christian faith, in opposition to some of the ancient, though *not* the *most ancient* Heathen philosophers. Those who first denied it grounded their opinion on very weak and inconclusive arguments:—(*a*) Taking for granted as an axiom, that "whatsoever hath a beginning must have an end," and consequently "whatsoever shall have no end, had no beginning." But this rests on *no general* reason, only on such *particular* observation of *such* things here below as from the ordinary way of generation tend in some space of time unto corruption: whence, seeing no such tendency in several parts of the world, they conclude that *it* was never generated, nor had any cause or original of its

---

71. Did the *most ancient* Heathen Philosophers hold a doctrine as to creation opposed to our Christian faith? state the arguments on which they who first in this

being. Whereas, properly, future existence or non-existence hath no such relation to the first production. And of things which may begin to be at the same instant, one may last but for an hour, another for a thousand years, another for ever: the difference being either in the nature of the things so made, or in the determination of the will of their Maker.—(*b*) Reasoning, from the very *name* of *Universe*, which comprehends all things, that, If the World or Universe were made, then were *all* things *made*,... . and then either all, or at least *something*, must have *made itself*, and so have been both cause and effect of itself, consequently in the same instant both have *been* and *not been*: a contradiction. But this fallacy is easily discovered: when we say all things were made, we must be understood to except Him who made them; [*vide supra, par.* 67.] (*c*) Fancying that if the world were made, it must be after the vulgar way of ordinary natural generations, in which two mutations are observable, the first from less to greater, or from worse to better, (proceeding from generation to perfection,) the second from greater to less, or from better to worse, (proceeding from perfection to corruption or dissolution); neither of which two mutations has ever yet been observed in this frame of the world. This argument however proves only (if so much), that the *whole frame* of the world, and the *more perfect parts* thereof, were not generated in that manner in which we see *some other parts* of it are (which no one denies); but by no means proves that there can be no other way of production, nor that the world was not some other way actually produced.—(*d*) Asserting that it is impossible for any thing to be produced out of nothing, or to be reduced to nothing; whence it must follow that the matter of the world hath always been and must always be. For the clear refutation of this difficulty, it is required

72. II. To give an explication of the *manner how the world was made:* this to be considered with reference

73. 1. To the *object* or *effect:* with respect to

---

respect denied the right faith grounded their opinions: and refute the fallacies involved in them. 72, 73, 77, 81. In what respects is the *manner how the world was made* to be considered? 73. What is the proper notion of the true

which the action by which the Heaven and Earth were made was the production of their total being, so that whatsoever entity they had when made had no real existence before they were so made; a manner of production which we usually term *Creation*, as excluding all concurrence of any material cause, and all dependence of any kind of subject, as pre-supposing no privation, as including no motion, as signifying a production out of nothing; *i. e.* by which something is made, and not any thing preceding out of which it is made. This notion of the true nature of *Creation* is to be collected—*Not* from the force of any word which some may think to express so much: the Latin word *Creatio* has no such necessary extent of meaning in its original or common use; nor has the *Hebrew* word used by Moses, "In the beginning God *created* the heaven and the earth," of itself any such peculiar acceptation; for it is often used synonymously with words signifying any kind of production or formation; and by itself seldom denotes a production out of nothing, but most frequently the making of one substance out of another pre-existing, the renovation or restoration of any thing, or the doing of some new and wonderful work, the producing of some strange and admirable effect: *But*—from the testimony of God the Creator, in His word, and of the world created, in our reason.—The opinion of the Church of the Jews sufficiently appears 2 Macc. vii. 28....."Look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider that God made them of things that were not:" a clear description of *Creation*, *i. e.*, production out

---

nature of *Creation*? State why it is not to be collected from etymology, Latin or Hebrew: and shew on what testimonies it really is collected—What was the opinion

of nothing. But this not being by all received as canonical, we prove it by the testimony of St Paul :... "God...calleth those things which be not as though they were ;" Rom. iv. 17. For as *to be called* in Scripture language is *to be*— compare "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should *be called* the sons of God ;" 1 John iii. 1. with "He hath given us power to become the sons of God ;" John i. 12.—so to *call* is to *make* or *cause to be :* "Thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them ;" Jer. xxxii. 23. where the original may imply no more than "Thou hast *called* this evil to them." He "calleth those things which be not as if they were," who maketh those things which were not, to be, and produced that which hath a being out of that which had not, *i. e.* out of nothing. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which *are seen*," *i. e.* which are, "were not made of things which do *appear*," *i. e.* were made of things which *did not appear*," *i. e.* which *were not.* Heb. xi. 3.

74. Vain therefore was that opinion of a real matter, coæval with God, as necessary for the production of the world by way of subject as the eternal and Almighty God by way of efficient. For then God would be (*a*) *Not Independent* in His actions, nor of infinite power and absolute activity ; if some real and material being must be presupposed without which God could not cause any thing to be, which is contrary to the Divine perfection : (*b*) *Nor All-sufficient ;* For if without something external He cannot demonstrate His

---

of the Church of the Jews on this subject? Quote apposite texts. 71. Shew the falsity of the opinion of the necessity of the existence of subject-matter for the production of the

attributes, &c. and if without something distinct from Himself He cannot produce any thing, He must *want* something external.—But it were a poor conception of the infinite and eternal God, to think Him not known to be Omnipotent but by the benefit of another; and "Almighty" were unwisely prefixed to "Maker of heaven and earth," if through a necessity of material concurrence the very making of them inferred *impotency.*

75. But in answer to the general position, that "Out of nothing, nothing can be produced:"

This *universal* proposition was first framed out of *particular* consideration of the works of art and nature. The maintainers of it, (*a*) Observing that no artificers can give any specimen of their art without materials, and perceiving the world to be a piece of art most exquisite, concluded that the maker of it was the most exact Artificer, and consequently had his matter from eternity prepared for him.—*Answer.* Most irrational from the weakness of some creatures to infer the same in the Creator. Whatsoever implies any excellency or perfection in the Artificer may be attributed to God; whatsoever implies any infirmity or imperfection must be excluded from the notion of Him. The wisdom and preconception, the order and beauty of operation, required in an Artist, is most eminently contained in Him who hath "ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight;" Wisd. xi. 20. but if the most absolute *idea* in the *Artificer's* understanding be not sufficient to produce his design without hands and materials, it no more follows that *God* needs pre-existing matter than that He is compounded of corporeal parts.—(*b*) Considering the works of nature and all parts of the world subject to generation and corruption, they observed that nothing is generated but out of something pre-existent, nor any mutation wrought but in a subject; and hence concluded that if the whole world were ever generated, it must have been produced out of some subject, and

---

word coævally with the Maker. 75. "Out of nothing nothing can be produced." Is this proposition true? Confute the argument drawn by the maintainers of it from their observation of the necessity of materials to artificers,

consequently there must be a matter eternally pre-existing. *Answer.* Absurd to judge of the production of the *world* by those *parts* of it which we see subject to generation, &c. and thence to conclude that if made at all *it* must have been generated as *they* were. For this manner of generation cannot possibly have been the *first* production even of the things *now generated: e. g.* we see plants now proceed from seed, fish from spawn, fowls from eggs: but this could not have been *so at first* all seed, spawn, eggs, naturally proceeding from precedent plants, fish, fowls. And even if any should possibly conceive that of *plants* and *oviparous* animals. (where the seed separated from the plant, &c. may long retain its power of germination, &c.) the *first might* arise from seed, &c. originally scattered on the earth, yet this is inconceivable in the case of *viviparous* animals. That *universal* maxim therefore that *nothing can be made of nothing,*—being raised solely out of observation of *continuing creatures by successive generation,* which *could not have been so continued without a being antecedent to all such succession,*—can have no place in the production of that antecedent or first being which we call creation.

76. There are two kinds of creation:—*Proper;* of things made *immediately* out of nothing; *e. g.* all immaterial substances, all angels and human souls, the heavens, and the elementel bodies, as the earth, water, air. See Gen. i. 1, 2.—*Improper;* of things made *mediately,* out of something formerly made out of nothing: *e. g.* all animals and vegetables. See Gen. i. 11. 20. "God formed man of the dust of the ground;" Gen. ii. 7.

77. 2. To the *Agent.* Whom we may regard,

78. (*a*) As *moved:* not by any external impulsive cause:—for all things distinct from Him having been produced out of nothing by Him must be posterior not only to the *motion* but the *actuation*

---

and from the present course of mutation and production of things. 76. Distinguish between *proper* and *improper* Creation; giving instances of each. 78, 79, 80. In what respects may we consider the *Agent* in creation? 78. Why must we regard Him as not moved by any external cause?

of His will :—but wholly and solely by *His own* infinite *goodness*. "There is none good but One, that is God." Matt. xix. 17.; none *originally*, *essentially*, *infinitely*, *independently*, good but He. All goodness in creatures is but by emanation from that fountain whose very being is diffusive; "God saw every thing that He had made, and behold it was very good," Gen. i. 31.; which shews the end of creating all things thus good was the communication of that by which they were, and appeared, so.

79. (*b*) As *free*, though moved by His goodness. The ancient heathens, fitly conceiving the goodness of God necessary, infinite, and eternal, erroneously concluded that whatsoever dependeth of it must be as necessary and eternal, that there being no instant imaginable before which God was not infinitely good, there can likewise be none conceivable before which the world was not made.—*Answer*. God is not only essentially and infinitely *good*, but in respect of all external actions or emanations absolutely *free*. i. Those bodies which act without understanding, *e. g.* the sun and fire, work always to the utmost of their power, nor can they suspend their action: but to conceive any such necessity in the divine operations were to deny all knowledge in God, and to make Him inferior to some of His own works. "He that made the ear, shall He not hear? &c." Psal. xciv. 9, 10. ii. Again, The *creatures* endued with understanding and consequently with will, may be necessitated in their actions by a greater

---

But by what? Quote texts. Contrast goodness in *creatures* with goodness in *God*. 79. What erroneous conclusion did the ancient heathens draw from their right conception of the *goodness* of God, as *eternal*, &c.? How refuted? Contrast *creatures*, (without and with understanding,) with *God*, in reference to freedom of action. What absurdity

power, or necessarily determined by the proposal of an infinite good: whereas, the former of these necessities is inconsistent with the Omnipotency of *God*, the latter with His All-sufficiency. Indeed if He were a *necessary* Agent in creation, the *creatures* would be of *necessary being;* a prerogative of the First Cause alone.

80. (*c.* 1.) As *determining* under that *freedom*, and (*c.* 2.) *so* performing that action. "He worketh all things after the *counsel* of His own *will;*" Eph. i. 11. Counsel is vain without election; a will weak without freedom. We cannot imagine that the Allwise God should act or produce any thing but what He determineth to produce. And His *actions* must be *free*, because proceeding from His *will*, which cannot [*vide supra*] be *moved* by anything *extrinsical* to Himself. Further, a *distinction* is to be made in the *equivocal* notion of *goodness*. If taken to signify a rectitude and excellency of *all* virtue, &c., with a negation of *all* things morally *evil*, &c., *so* God is *necessarily good:* but if taken in another sense,—in which the heathens here refuted took it —rather for *beneficence*, or *communicativeness* of some *good* to *others*, *then* God is *not necessarily*, but *freely*, good. For He had not been at all evil or unjust if He had never made any thing, never thus communicated any of His perfections. *Every* proprietary being accounted master of his own, &c., much more must that one eternal and independent Being be wholly *free* in the communicating His own perfections. We must then look no further than to the *determination* of God's will in the

---

would follow if God were a *necessary* Agent in creation? 80. (*c.* 1.) Why must the *actions* of *God* be *free*? In what sense is God *necessarily* in what sense *freely*—*good?* 80. (*c.* 2.) Shew that God *creates* by *determining* to *create.* Quote texts.

creation of the world.—(*c.* 2.) For with Him to *will* is to *effect*, to *determine* is to *perform*. "Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure (*i.e.* by Thy will) they are [exist] and were created;" Rev. iv. 11. Where there is no resistance in the *object*, no need of preparation, application, &c., in the *agent*, there the actual determination of the will is a sufficient production. Thus God did *make* the heavens and the earth by *willing* them to *be*. "*Let there be* light; and *there was* light," Gen. i. 3.; where the command of God, "*let there be*," and the present existence of the creature, "*there was*," are so intimately and immediately the same that they are expressed in the *original* without difference in point or letter. "God is in the heavens: He hath done whatsoever He pleased," Psal. cxv. 3.; yea, created the heavens because He pleased, nay, more, created them by willing their creation.

81. 3. With respect to the *time* of creation:— Although it be true that there is *no* instant *assignable before which God could not* have made the world, yet by that faith through which "we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God," Heb. xi. 3.; we are assured that whatsoever *possibility* of an *eternal* existence of the creature by the free determination of God's will may be *imagined*, *actually* it *had* a *temporal* beginning. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old," saith *Wisdom;* Prov. viii. 22. And the same Wisdom of God, made man, speaks of "the glory which He had with the Father before the world was;" John xvii. 5. In the same Christ are we

---

81. Shew that the existence of the creature, however it might be *imagined* as *possibly eternal*, *actually* had a *temporal beginning*. Quote texts.

"blessed with all spiritual blessings, according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world;" Eph. i. 3. The *impossibility* of the *origination* of a *circular* motion (which we are sure is either in heaven or earth) and the *impropriety* of the *beginning* of *time*, are exceptions so poor as to need no refutation. The *actual* eternity of the world is of itself most improbable; and even without the certainty of faith the world carries the clearest evidences of its *novelty*.

82. There are indeed some ancient accounts of the world's immense antiquity. The Egyptian priests pretended an exact chronology for myriads of years; *falsely;* for they manifestly made great exaggerations of the antiquity of *other* nations; *e.g.* they gave Alexander an account of the Persian and Macedonian empires for 8000 years;) and may well be suspected to have made much greater in honour of their own country; moreover, the Egyptians represent their first king's reigns as above 1200 years apiece, and the Assyrians theirs above 40,000 apiece: ridiculously incredible, except indeed taken respectively for months and days. The Chaldæans or Assyrians had also tables of the eclipses of the sun and moon recorded for an immense length of years; such *calculations* however may manifestly be made correctly either backwards or forwards, irrespectively of the *actual* occurrence of the eclipses, which must depend on the real existence of the sun, &c. at the time set down. The eclipses of the sun and moon recorded in the Egyptian temples might as well be described from *proleptical* supposition as taken from real observation. The palpably fabulous account too of the sun having twice risen in the

---

82. State particulars as to certain accounts of the *immense* antiquity of the world:—and shew such accounts to be *primâ facie* absurd or nugatory.

East and set in the West as now, and twice risen and set *vice versâ*, recorded by them as equally authentic with their other observations, makes all the rest of their observations unworthy of credit.

83. These feigned observations and fabulous descriptions of the world's antiquity are contradicted not only by the infallible annals of the Spirit of God, but even by the testimonies of more sober men, and by the real apparencies and face of things. i. The historians have no footsteps, the poets even feign no actions, of so great antiquity. ii. The necessaries of life, the ways of freedom and commerce among men, the invention of arts and sciences, the letters we use, and the languages we speak, all have known originals. The first beginnings were so acknowledged by all, that the inventors in return for their inventions were reckoned and worshipped among their gods. iii. If we search into the nations themselves, we shall see none without some original: and but for the want of extant authors on such subjects the first rudiments of settlements, cities, &c. would appear as evident as their latter growth and present condition. We know what ways within 2000 years people have made through vast and thick woods for their habitations, now as fertile and populous as any. The Hercynian forest, so immense in the time of the Cæsars, was reckoned even then coæval with the world. We read without show of contradiction how this Western

---

83. With what infallibly true account of the time of creation is the view just mentioned of the *immense* antiquity of the world inconsistent? Shew that it derives no support from ancient Historians and Poets; and is inconsistent with what we know of the invention of arts and sciences, &c.—the origin of nations, &c. Give some particulars in illustration. Whence did the pretence of immense Babylonish antiquity originate?

part of the world was peopled ; all the pretence of the Babylonish antiquity is nothing else but that we all came from thence. The dispersion in the plain of Shinar hath peopled all other parts of the world.

84. To these arguments not only they who make the world *eternal*, but they also who confessing it *made* account it *far more ancient* than we believe it, strangely reply, That this world has suffered many alterations by utter depopulations of countries, caused by deluge, fire, plagues, earthquakes ; whereby all monuments of antiquity were defaced, all arts and sciences lost, &c. and so mankind reduced to paucity and the world often again returned into its infancy. But this answer affords two advantages to the Christian faith ; manifestly shewing i. that they had an universal tradition of Noah's flood, &c. ii. and also that they had no way to uphold the eternity or immense antiquity of the world, in opposition to history and appearences of things themselves, except by merely *supposing* innumerable deluges and deflagrations.

85. It remains then that we steadfastly believe not only that all things were *created*, but also that they were created by the hand of God in the manner and at the time delivered by His Spirit in the books of Moses ; and so acknowledge a *novity* of the creature. Nor will the novity of the world appear more plainly to our conceptions than by reflecting on our own generations.—When the age of man was long in the infancy of the world we find ten generations extend to 1656 years according to the Hebrew computation, to 2256 according to the Septuagint. From the flood to the birth of Abraham not above ten (if so many) generations

---

84. What do the asserters, some of the *eternity*, others of the *immense antiquity*, of the world, object to the arguments for its novelty brought forward in *par.* 83 ? Shew the objection unfounded. What two advantages does the propounding of it afford to the Christian faith ?

85. What are we to believe as to the *actual time* of Creation ? Where is this authoritatively recorded ? Shew from calculations based on Scripture, and conclusions

took up 292 years according to the least, 1132 according to the largest account. And it is agreed by all, that since the birth of Abraham there have not passed 3700 years. Since that time the ages of men have been very much alike proportionably long. And by the experience of eminent families, by Scripture genealogies, by the observation and judgment of former ages, three generations usually take up 100 years. Wherefore it is not probable that any person now alive is above 130 generations removed from Adam. We now come

86. III. To demonstrate the *Person* to whom Creation is ascribed.

87. I. The creation of the world was performed by (*a*) that *one God* in whom we believe, (*b*) the *Father* of *our Lord Jesus Christ.*

88. (*a*) There is no such difference between things of the world as to infer a diversity of Makers, nor is the worst of creatures in their *original* any way derogatory to the Creator. "God saw every thing that He had made, and behold, it was very good;" Gen. i. 31. Whatsoever is evil is so *not originally* by the Creator's action, but by the creature's defection.—Vainly then did heretics of old, dividing all things of this world into natures substantially evil and substantially good, imagine therefore one God essentially good, called Light, as the first principle of the one, another God essentially evil, called Darkness, as the original of the other. "*I* form the light and create darkness; *I* make peace

---

drawn from human observation and experience, the number of generations above which it is not probable that any one now living is distant from Adam. How does the statement so obtained bear on the present argument? 87. By *what one* God was the Creation of the world performed? 88. Shew that no argument for diversity of Makers can be justly derived from any difference among things created, nor from the *present* badness of some of them. By what vain conceit did certain ancient Heretics try to account for

and create evil; *I* the *Lord* do all these things," saith He who also said, "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides Me;" Isai. xlv. 7, 5.

89. (*b*) That *one God* we have already proved to be the *Father;* we must further shew that one God the *Father* to be the Maker of the World. i. "Lord, Thou art God, which hast made heaven and earth and the sea, and all that in them is: against Thy holy child Jesus,.....Herod &c. were gathered together;" Acts iv. 24. The Father of Jesus Christ is here manifestly declared the Creator of the world. ii. Again, we know Christ is the *light of the Gentiles* by His own interpretation; we are assured likewise that His Father *gave* Him, by His frequent assertion: we may then certainly conclude that the *Father of Christ* is the *Creator* of the world by the Prophet's express prediction, "Thus saith the Lord, He that created the heavens, &c. I the Lord.....will keep thee, and *give thee* for a covenant of the people, for a *light of the Gentiles;*" Isai. xlii. 5, 6, But

90. 2. Since whosoever is that one God who created the world cannot be excluded from this act of Creation, and since we believe the Son and Spirit to be the same God with the Father, and since moreover the Apostles teach us that the *Son* made all things, and the Prophets that they were produced by the *Spirit*, how is it that in the Creed we attribute Creation *peculiarly* to the Father? *Answer.* (*a*) In respect of those heresies, arising in the infancy of the Church, which endeavoured to introduce *another* Creator of the world, distinguished from the *Father* of our Lord *Jesus Christ;* an error utterly subversive of the

---

the contrariety *now* subsisting in the created things which are respectively good and evil? Quote texts in refutation. 89. Shew the Maker of the world to be identical with the Father of Jesus Christ. Quote texts. 90. Shew that the

gospel, which.....pretends to no other God than the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob:..... Him whom Moses and the Prophets call Lord of heaven and earth our blessed Saviour addresses, "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth;" Luke x. 21.—(*b*) In respect of the Paternal priority in the Deity, by reason whereof what is common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may be rather attributed to the *Father* as the First Person in the Trinity. So the Apostle makes a distinction: "To us there is but one God, the *Father*, *of* whom are all things; and we in Him;—and One Lord, Jesus Christ, *by* whom are all things, and we by Him;" 1 Cor. viii. 6. Our Saviour acknowledges, "The Son can do nothing of Himself but what He seeth the Father do;" John v. 19. which speaks some kind of priority in action according to that of the Person.

Practical uses of belief in God the Father Almighty as the Maker of Heaven and Earth.

91. This belief is necessary: (*a*) As indispensably tending to the illustration of God's glory; the splendour of which appears to us in and through the works of His hands. "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, &c." Rom. i. 20. "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all!" Psal. civ. 24. If then God have "made all things for Himself," Prov. xvi. 4. *i. e.* for the manifestation of His glorious attributes, "the Lord rejoiceth in His works," because "His glory shall endure for ever," Psal. civ. 31. then must we confess Him "Maker of Heaven and Earth," that we may sufficiently praise and glorify Him. "Let them praise the name of the Lord, for His name alone is excellent, His glory is above heaven and earth;" Psal. cxlviii. 13.—[Many other texts quoted:] Neh. ix.

Son and the *Spirit* cannot be *excluded* from the act of creation. In what two respects is it *peculiarly* attributed to the *Father?* 91. What are the practical uses of belief in God the Father Almighty as the *Maker of Heaven and*

5, 6 ; Rom. xi. 36 ; Psal. cxlviii. 2., &c. ; Rev. iv. 10, 11. - Wherefore, if "the heavens declare the glory of God," and "all His works praise Him," then, "shall His saints bless Him, they shall speak of the glory of His kingdom, and talk of His power ;" Psal. xix. 1 ; cxlv. 10, 11. (*b*) As most effectual towards man's humiliation. "When I consider the heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained ;" Psal. viii. 3. when I view those glorious apparent bodies with my eye, and by a glass find greater numbers, before beyond my sight, and thence judge there may be many millions more, which neither eye nor instrument can reach, when I contemplate those far more glorious Spirits, the inhabitants of the heavens, and attendants on Thy throne, — "what is man that Thou art mindful of him ?" what that.....dust and ashes, "the Son of man, that Thou visitest him ?" Psal. viii. 4. that Thou shouldest look down from heaven, and take care or notice of him ? But if our *original* ought so far to humble us, how should our *fall* abase us ! that we only of all God's creatures should comply with him who first opposed his Maker ! Those works of God which are not endued with understanding are in a happy impossibility of sinning : the glorious Sprits attending on the throne of God, once in a condition of themselves to fall, are now by the grace of God preserved, and placed beyond a possibility of sinning : but men, the sons of fallen Adam, of all creatures are the only companions of those angels who "left their own habitations," Jude ver. 6. and are "delivered into chains of darkness, &c." 2 Pet. ii. 4. How should we be humbled in the sight of Him whom we alone of all the creatures by our unrepented sins drew unto repentance ! "It repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, &c." Gen. vi. 6.—(*c*) As productive of most cheerful and universal obedience. "Thy hands have made me and fashioned me ; give me understanding that I may learn Thy commandments ;" Psal. cxix. 73. By our first production God hath absolute dominion over us, consequently a right to our most exact and complete obedience. And of all the creatures derived from God's goodness none ever disobeyed Him but the devil and

Earth ? Quote texts throughout. 91. *b.* In order to our more effectual humiliation what should we reflect on together with our creation ? 91. *c.* Of all God's creatures

man. "Mine hand hath laid the foundation of the earth, and My right hand hath spanned the heavens: when I call them, they stand up together;" Isai. xlviii. 13. "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their hosts by numbers: He calleth them by their names,.....not one faileth;" Isai. xl. 26. The Lord commanded, and "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera;" Judg. v. 20. He "commanded the ravens to feed Elias; and they brought Him bread and flesh, &c." 1 Kings xvii. 4. 6. He spake to the whale, "and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land;" Jonah ii. 10, "Fire and hail, snow and vapours, wind and storm, fulfil His word;" Psal. cxlviii. 8. If the universal obedience of the creature to the Creator's will cannot move us also to serve and please Him they will all testify against and condemn us when God shall call unto them, saying, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, -I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against Me;" Isai. i. 2.—(*d*) As affording meditation for the consolation of the servants of God in all conditions. "Happy is he whose hope is in the Lord his God, who made heaven and earth, &c." Psal. cxlvi. 5, 6. This happiness consists, partly in a full assurance of His *power* to *secure* us, His *ability* to *satisfy* us: "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein: For He hath founded it upon the seas, and prepared it upon the floods;" Psal. xxiv. 1, 2. Hast thou not known..... that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?" Isai. xl. 28.; partly in a comfortable assurance of the *will* of God to *protect* and *succour* us, of His *desire* to *preserve* and *bless* us. "My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth: He will not suffer thy foot to be moved; Psal. cxxi. 2, 3. God "will not despise the work of his own hands;" Job x. 3. See Isai. liv. 16, 17.

Summary of truths confessed in ART. I. §. 5.

92. I believe that Heaven and Earth and all things contained in them have not their being of themselves,

———

which only have proved disobedient? 91. *d.* In what consists the happiness of him "whose hope is in the Lord his God, who made heaven and earth?" 92. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his

but were made in the beginning, by mediate or immediate creation, so that antecedently to all things besides these was at first nothing but God, who produced most of the world out of nothing, and the rest out of what was formerly made out of nothing: This I believe was done by the most free act of His will, moved by His goodness alone; performed by the determination of His will at the time which pleased him, probably within 130 generations of men, certainly within not more than 6000 or at farthest 7000 years. I acknowledge this God, Creator of the world, the same God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: and thus *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH.

ART. II. And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord.

93. According to the Son's prescription, "Ye believe in God, believe also in Me;" John xiv. 1.—the Father's injunction "that we should believe in the name of His Son Jesus Christ;" 1 John iii. 23.—and the sacramental institution;—as we are baptized, so do we believe in the name of the Father *and the Son*.—Our blessed Saviour in this Article is represented by His *nomination*, as *Jesus Christ;* by His *generation*, as the *Only Son* of *God;* by His *dominion*, as *our Lord*.

§. 1. AND IN JESUS.

94. *Jesus* is the proper name of our Saviour, given to Him at His circumcision according to the customary manner among the Jews. The name itself also was of ordinary use; we read in Scripture of "*Jesus* called Justus;" Col. iv. 11. and of "a certain sorcerer, a Jew, whose name

---

belief in God the Father Almighty as the *Maker of Heaven and Earth*. 93. Quote texts enjoining belief in the Son of God. In what respects is our Saviour represented in Article II.? 94. What *kind* of name belonging to our Saviour is *Jesus*? When given to Him? Was it

was *Bar-Jesus*," i. e. Son of Jesus ; Acts xiii. 6.—Josephus mentions many of the name :—Ecclesiasticus is called the Wisdom of *Jesus* the son of Sirach, himself the son of another *Jesus* — St Stephen speaks of "the tabernacle of witness brought in with *Jesus* into the possession of the Gentiles ;" Acts vii. 45. and St Paul observes that "if *Jesus* had given them (the Israelites) rest, then would He not afterwards have spoken of another day ;" Heb. iv. 8. which two scriptures being undoubtedly understood of *Joshua* the son of Nun, shew that *Jesus* is the same name with *Joshua*, which being at its first imposition *Jehoshua*, by contraction, and by addition of the Greek termination, became *Jesus*.

95. For the proper interpretation of *Jesus* we must then look back on him who first bore that name. "And Moses called *Oshea*, the son of Nun, *Jehoshua*," Numb. xiii. 16. His first name, imposed at circumcision, was *Oshea* or *Hoseah ;* the same as that of the last king of Israel, of the prophet the son of Beeri, and of the son of Azaziah, ruler of Ephraim, 1 Chron. xxvii. 20. It denotes *Saviour*.

96. The alteration of *Hoshea* (הושע) into *Jehoshua* (יהושע), (afterwards used as distinct names,) (*a*) was made by *addition ;*.....(*b*) Of one letter only, the most frequent in Hebrew names ; an addition however so solemnly made on the viewing of the land of Canaan, that it must be thought (the augmented name appearing equivalent to "*he* saves" or, "will save") to give a present designation of his person to be a Saviour of the Israelites, and future certainty of Salvation to them by his means.—(*c*) Another letter may be *virtually* added, the first of *Hoseah* not admitting duplication. If then to *Hoshea* we prefix *Jah*, one of the titles of God, the result will be *Jehoshua :* as if Moses had said, This is

---

an usual name among the Jews? Give examples. With what Hebrew name is it identical, and how formed from it? 95. Who was first named by the Hebrew name identical with Jesus? Mention other persons who bore it. What change, and when, was made in the name of the person first so named? 96. What was the difference

he by whom *God* will save His people from their enemies.

97. Since then *Jesus* is the same name with *Josuah*, since the name *Josuah* was first imposed by Divine designation to certify the fulfilling to the Israelites by him who bore it all that was signified by it, and since *Jesus* was likewise named by a more immediate, and angelical, imposition from heaven, therefore we believe Him infallibly designed by God to perform to the sons of men whatsoever is implied in His nomination.

98. As in *Hoseah* was expressed *salvation*, in *Josuah* was added at least the designation of that single person to save, and that with certainty: probably even the name of God by whom he was made a Saviour.—So in *Jesus*. The angel Gabriel told the blessed Virgin she should..... "bring forth a son, and should call His name *Jesus*;" Luke i. 31. In Joseph's dream the angel interpreted the name; "Thou shalt call His name *Jesus*, for *He shall save* His people from their sins;" Matt. i. 21. words clearly expressing the designation of the person, and the futurition of salvation certain by Him. Moreover, the addition of the name of *God*, *probable* in *Josuah*, appears here *more* than *probable*: (*a*) *Not* barely "*He*," but "*He Himself*," (Αὐτός,) shall save. *Josuah* saved Israel *not* by *his own* power, *not* of *himself*, but *God* by him; saved *not his own* people, but the people of *God*: whereas *Jesus Himself* by *His own* power, the power of God, shall save *His own* people, the people of *God*. Well therefore may we understand His name equivalent to "God the Saviour."—(*b*) On the prediction of the name *Jesus*, and its interpretation by the angel, the Evangelist observes, "All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, 'Behold, a Virgin..... shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call His

---

between his successive names; and what appears to be implied by the change? 97. From the identity of the names *Jesus* and *Josuah*, and from the circumstances under which they were given respectively to our Saviour and to the Jewish leader, what do you infer as to the work to the performance of which Jesus was divinely designated? 98. What was the angelical interpretation given in Joseph's dream to the name Jesus? Shew that

name *Emmanuel*,' which, being interpreted, is *God with us*;" Matt. i. 22. 23. No explanation of the fulfilment of that prophecy can appear more proper than that the *sense* of *Emmanuel* (though by that name our Saviour was not actually called) should be comprehended in the name of *Jesus*: and what else is *God with us* than *God our Saviour?*

99. However, the constant Scripture-interpretation of this name *Jesus* is *Saviour*. "Unto you is born.....a *Saviour*, which is Christ the Lord;" Luke ii. 11. "Of this man's seed hath God..... raised unto Israel a *Saviour*, *Jesus*;" Acts xiii. 23. An explication not more new or strange than was the name. i. The ancient Grecians gave it as a title to their gods, whom after any remarkable preservation they styled *Saviours*; ii. and even in flattery called those *men* their *Saviours*, for whom they seemed to have as great respect as for their Gods. iii. In a justifiable sense too it may be ascribed to *man*. The Judges *Othniel* and *Ehud*, in our translation *Deliverers* of Israel, are in the Hebrew *Saviours*.

100. The name *Saviour*, however, belongeth to Christ in a more peculiar and sublime manner than it was attributed to heathen Gods, or to men. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved;" Acts

---

it corresponds with the *heightening* of sense in *Josuah* as distinguished from *Hoseah*. Why does it appear that the addition to the name of *God*, *probable* in *Josuah*, is *more than probably* contained in *Jesus?* 99. What is the constant Scripture interpretation of the name of Jesus? Quote texts. To whom and under what circumstances, did the ancient Greeks give the title of *Saviours?* To what *men* do we find it given in the Old Testament? 100—103. In what respects is Jesus *peculiarly* and *properly* called our Saviour?

iv. 12.—He is truly and properly called *our Saviour.*

101. 1. Because He hath *revealed* the only true way for obtaining eternal salvation. If those preachers of the Gospel who received the way of salvation from Him, which they delivered to others, be said to *save* their converts,—as St Paul "provoked to emulation them which were his flesh, that *he* might *save* some of them;" Rom. xi. 14. and "was made all things to all men that *he* might by any means *save* some;" 1 Cor. ix. 22. and exhorted Timothy to "take heed unto himself, &c. for in so doing *he* should both *save* himself and them that heard him;" 1 Tim. iv. 16. and St James declared....."he which converteth a sinner from the error of his ways shall *save* a soul from death;" James v. 19, 20.—if *these* are said to *save* the souls of them who are converted by the doctrine which they deliver, far more eminently must *He* be said to *save* them, whose ministers the Apostles, &c. are, and in whose name they speak. For *He* it was which "came and preached peace to them which were afar off, and to them that were nigh;" Eph. ii. 17. See John i. 18. "The Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth;" Rom. i. 16. *He* alone it was who "brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel;" 2 Tim i. 10.

102. 2. Because He hath also *procured* the way of salvation. "God sent His son into the world that the world through Him might be saved;" John iii. 17.—(*a*) We were all concluded under

---

101. How are preachers of the Gospel in Scripture said to *save* persons? Contrast them in this respect with Jesus. 102. In what respects hath Jesus *procured* our salvation? Quote texts.

sin, and the wages of sin being death, were obliged to eternal punishment, whence it was impossible to be freed, unless the sin were first *remitted*. Now "without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that Christ should appear to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself;" Heb. ix. 22, &c. Accordingly He "shed His blood for many for the remission of sins;" Matt. xxvi. 28. He "bare our sins in His own body on the tree;" 1 Pet. ii. 24. and so in Him "we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins;" Col. i. 14. and "if while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us, much more then, being now justified by His blood, shall we be saved from wrath by Him;" Rom. v. 8, 9.—(*b*) Again, we were all enemies unto God, and having offended Him, there was no way of salvation but by being *reconciled* unto Him. And "wherewith should we reconcile ourselves unto our Master?" 1 Sam. xxix. 4. Through *Jesus* only. For "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, &c." 2 Cor. v. 19. And as under the Law "the blood of the sin-offering was brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place," Lev. vi. 30. so it pleased the Father through the Son, "having made peace by the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself;" And thus "us who were enemies in our mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death;" Col. i. 20, &c. on which reconciliation must follow our salvation. "For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of His Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by His life;" Rom. v. 10.—(*c*) Further, we were all at first enslaved by sin, and made captive by Satan,

without possible escape but by *Redemption*. By the Law of Moses, "if any were able, he might redeem himself;" Lev. xxv. 49. this we could not do, because absolute obedience in all our actions being due to God, no act of ours can make any satisfaction for the least offence. Under the Law, he too which "was sold might be redeemed again; one of his brethren might redeem him;" Lev. xxv. 48. But none of the *mere* sons of men, alike captive and unable to redeem themselves, could satisfy for others. No brother therefore, save that son of man who is the Son of God, who was like us in all respects, sin only excepted, could work this redemption for us. And this He freely did. For "the Son of man came to give His life a ransom for many;" Matt. xx. 28. and accordingly "gave Himself a ransom for all;" 1 Tim. ii. 6. So that in Him "we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins;" Eph. i. 7. "being bought with a price;" 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23. "redeemed not with corruptible things.....but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot;" 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

103. 3. Because, yet further, He finally (in reward of what He suffered) *confers* on us the salvation which He promised to, and obtained for, us. "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them;" Heb. vii. 25. Set down at the right hand of the throne of God, He hath received all power both in heaven and earth; power which the Father gave the Son "that He should give eternal life to as many as the Father had given Him;" John xvii. 2. And accordingly

---

103 Quote texts in reference to Jesus' *conferring* final *salvation*.

"we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, from heaven, who shall change our vile body, &c." Philip. iii. 20, 21. See Heb. ix. 28.

104. Thus hath Christ by His blood obtained remission of our sins, by His grace hath taken away the dominion of sin, and in the life to come will free us from the possibility of sinning, and abolish death the wages of sin: wherefore well said the Angel, "Thou shalt call his name *Jesus*, for He shall *save* His people from their sins;" Matt. i. 21. Well did Zacharias call Him "a horn of *salvation*;" Luke i. 69. Simeon, "the *salvation* of God;" Luke ii. 30. St. Paul "the captain and author of eternal *salvation*;" Heb. v. 9. and ii. 10. St Peter, "a Prince and a *Saviour*;" Acts v. 31. correspondent to those Judges of Israel raised up by God to deliver His people, and therefore called *Saviours*. See Neh. ix. 27.

105. This correspondency will best appear if considered particularly in *Josuah* .....Though Moses was really a "ruler and deliverer," Acts vii. 35. which is the same with *Saviour*, though the rest of the Judges were in like manner *Saviours*, yet *Josuah* far more particularly and exactly than the rest is represented as the type of our *Jesus*, and so manifested even in his name. He alone of all who passed out of Egypt was designed to lead the Israelites into Canaan, the land of promise, a type of the heavenly inheritance of the saints: and so is he a type of Him who only can bring us into the presence of God, and there prepare and assign our mansions, as *Josuah* divided the land for an inheritance to the tribes. Further, *Josuah* in seating the Israelities in Canaan *did* what *Moses could not* do, who brought them out of Egypt, but left them in the wilderness. Now *Moses* in Scripture is frequently taken for the *Law delivered by Moses*: hence the death of Moses and the succession of *Josuah*

---

104. Quote some texts which especially (in words or meaning) term Jesus a Saviour. To what Jewish Deliverers or *Saviours* does He thus especially correspond? 105, 106. Illustrate this correspondency *especially* by particulars

presignified the continuance of the Law till *Jesus* came, "by whom all that believe are justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses:" Acts xiii. 39. "The Law and the Prophets were until John, &c." Luke xvi. 16. See Rom. iii. 20, &c. Moses indeed seems to have taken *Josuah* up with him into the Mount; Exod. xxiv. 13. but if so, surely it was to enter the cloud which covered the mount where the glory of the Lord abode: for without *Jesus*, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." there is no approaching to the presence of God.—To *Josuah*, not to Moses, the Lord said....."Circumcise again the children of Israel the second time;" Jos. v. 2. which speaks *Jesus* to be the true Circumciser, the author of another circumcision than that of the flesh commanded by the Law, even "the circumcision of the heart in the spirit and not in the letter," Rom. ii. 29. "made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," Col. ii. 11. and called the "circumcision of Christ."

106. Thus *Josuah*, i. as minister of Moses, is a type of Christ, "the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God;' Rom xv. 8. ii as successor of Moses represents *Jesus*, inasmuch as "the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ;" John i. 17. iii. As Judge and Ruler of Israel, there is scarce an action not clearly predictive of our Saviour.* He begins his office at

---

relating to *Josuah*, shewing their resemblance to particulars in the life, office, &c. of *Jesus*. Quote relevant texts.

* Our venerable author may here and elsewhere occasionally be thought liable to some such observation as his own (*infra*, *par.* 260.) on the "forward zeal of some antient fathers" who exceeded the due bounds of typical application. The reader may find much useful information and judicious criticism on the history and just limits of typical interpretation in Conybeare's Bampton Lectures for 1824: a work which unites critical soberness with reverential piety. Let me quote here his judgment expressed in Lect. VIII. of "the necessity and wisdom *of restraining in general our exposition of scriptural types to those express points in which the Scripture itself authorizes us to consider them as typical, or which immediately flow from the nature of the relation or character which we are taught to regard as constituting the analogy between the type and its antitype.*" G.

name of *Jesus*, as that wherein all our happiness is involved. "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, &c. For unto you is born.....a Saviour, &c." Luke ii. 10, 11. Even as Isaiah had foretold, that when "the people that walk in darkness should see a great light," when "unto us a child should be born, &c." then should they joy before God according to the joy of harvest, &c." Isai. ix. 2. &c. See Isai xxxv. 4, 10.--(*c*) To *kindle* and *raise* our *love towards Him*, engaging us to hate all things as far as they oppose Him, or even pretend to an equal share of affection with Him. "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me, &c." Matt. x. 37. "If any man come unto Me, and hate not his father and mother, &c. he cannot be My disciple;" Luke xiv. 26. "God so loved the world, that He gave his only-begotten Son;" John iii. 16. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his *friends*;" John xv. 13. but "while we were yet sinners, i. e. *enemies*, Christ died for us," Rom. v. 8. and so became our *Jesus*. Shall thus the Father shew His love in His Son? the Son His love in Himself? and shall we not study a requital? or is there any proper return of love but love? "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha;" 1 *Cor.* xvi. 22.—(*d*) To produce in us a fitting *esteem of Him* and absolute *obedience* to *Him*. St Paul "counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord, &c." Philip. iii. 8. "If ye love Me, keep my commandments:" John xiv. 15. "This is the love of God, that we keep His commandments;" 1 John v. 3. "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey Him?" Matt. viii. 27. And what manner of men are disobedient Christians, who refuse obedience to Him whom the senseless wind and sea obeyed? Shall the devils, who were cast out by the name of *Jesus*, obey that name, which signifieth nothing to *them*, for "He took not on Him the nature of angels," Heb. ii 16. and so is *not their Saviour!* and can we refuse obedience to Him who "took on Him the seed of Abraham," and became obedient unto death even the death of the cross" Philip. ii. 8. for us, that He might be raised to full power over us, and so enabled at last to save us, and in the mean time to govern us, and exact our highest veneration; For "God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of *Jesus* every knee should bow, &c." Philip. ii. 9, 10.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. II. §. 1.

108. I believe not only that there is a God who made the world, but also as a certain truth, that there was and is a man, by the ministry of an angel named *Jesus*, of whom particularly Josuah, the first of that name, and all the rest of the Judges and Saviours of Israel, were but types. I believe that *Jesus*, in the highest importance of that name, to be the *Saviour* of the world, inasmuch as He 1. hath *revealed* to men the only way of *salvation*; and 2. *wrought out salvation* for them through His blood, (*a*) obtaining *remission* for sinners, (*b*) making *reconciliation* for enemies, and (*c*) paying the price of *redemption* for captives; and 3. shall at last Himself actually *confer* the *salvation* revealed and wrought out by Him, on all who unfeignedly and steadfastly believe in Him. I acknowledge there is no way to Heaven but that which He hath shewn us, no means to procure it for us but His blood, no person which shall confer it on us but Himself. Thus *I believe in* JESUS.

ART. 1. §. 2. AND IN JESUS CHRIST.

109. For the full explication of *Christ*, the *title* of our Saviour's *office*, usually joined with His *proper* name, *Jesus*, it is required,

110. I. To shew the *signification* of the word.—(*a*) We find in the Scriptures two several names, *Messias* and *Christ*, but both of the same signification, as appears by the speech of the woman of Samaria, "I know that *Messias* cometh, which is called *Christ*;" John iv. 25. and by what

---

108. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in *Jesus*. 109. 110. 112. 115. 118. 131. What is required for the full explication of the term *Christ*? 109. What *kind* of name is *Christ* as belonging to our Saviour? 110. What does the word *Christ* signify? What is the synonymous Oriental word? In what passages of the New Testament is the former given as explanatory of the latter? And why? Which name is used by the writers of the New Testament, and retained by the Latins and ourselves?

Andrew spake to his brother Simon, "We have found the *Messias*, which is, being interpreted, the *Christ*;" John i. 41. *Messias*, the spoken Syriac language of the Samaritan woman and Andrew; *Christ*, the interpretation of St John, who wrote in Greek. Both alike mean the *Anointed*. The Greek name was used by St Paul and the rest of the Apostles, writing in that language, and retained by the Latins and ourselves, they constantly using the term *Christus*, and we *Christ*.

111. (*b*) The *full* interpretation of the word however must be understood not simply according to the *action*, but the *purport*, of *anointing*; for in the Law whatsoever was anointed was thereby set apart as ordained to some special use or office. "Jacob poured oil on the top of a pillar;" Gen. xxviii. 18. thus consecrating it. Moses anointed the tabernacle and all the vessels, thus dedicating them. "The Priest that is Anointed" signifies the High Priest, because invested in that office by unction. When Jesus therefore is called the *Messias* or *Christ*, and that long after the anointing oil had ceased, it signified no less than a person set apart by God, anointed with most sacred oil, advanced to the highest office, of which all those employments under the Law conferred by unction were but types and shadows.

112. II. To shew *on what grounds* the Jews always expected a *Christ* or *Messias*.—1. That there was among them such an expectation is evident. The Samaritan woman could say, "*I know* that Messias cometh," And the unbelieving Jews, not acknow-

---

111. What was the *purport* of the anointings practised under the Law? Give illustrative instances of the practice from the Old Testament. What is hence to be inferred as to the *full* import of *Messias* or *Christ* as a title applied to our Saviour? 112. Quote passages, with requisite remarks

ledging Him already come, expect Him still. Thus we find "all men musing in their hearts of John, whether *he* were the Christ or not;" Luke iii. 15. When Jesus taught in the Temple, those who doubted said, "When Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence He is;" those who believed, "When Christ cometh, will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done?" John vii. 27, 31. *all* expecting a *Christ* to come. "Many of the people said, of a truth this is the Prophet; others said, This is the Christ." ver. 40, 41. The first question put by the Priests and Levites to John on his beginning to baptize, "who art thou?" meant, whether he were the Christ or no? as appears from his answer, "And he confessed..... I am not the Christ."..... Clearly therefore the Jews had a general expectation of a Messias to come; nor only so, but it was always with them an obligatory article of faith, which whosoever denied was accounted to deny the Law and the Prophets. As to the grounds of their expectation;

113. 2. (*a*) Most certainly the *Messias* was promised by God, both before and under the Law. God said unto Abraham, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called;" Gen. xxi. 12. a promise of a Messias to come, as St Paul teaches us, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made..... thy *seed*, which is Christ;" Gal. iii. 16. The Lord said unto Moses, "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee;" Deut. xviii. 18. and St Peter hath satisfied us that this promised Prophet

---

from the Gospel History, shewing that the Jews evidently *expected* a Christ to come. 113. "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." How does St Paul refer to this passage as relating to Christ? How does St Peter apply the prediction made to Moses of a Prophet to be subsequently raised up

is *Jesus* the *Christ*. Acts iii. 22. Many are the prophecies and promises concerning Him; yet some very obscure, others, though plainer, yet relating only to the *person*, *not* to the *notion* or the *word Messias*. Wheresoever He is spoken of as the *Anointed*, it *may* well be understood first of some other person, except Dan. ix. 26. where *Messias* (the Greek translation however has *Unction*) is foretold to be *cut off*. The universal Jewish expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the *Messias* may then seem somewhat strange.

114. 2. (*b*) But we must consider that in the seventy years of the Babylonish captivity, the ordinary Jews had lost the exact understanding of the old Hebrew language, and therefore the Scriptures when read to the people were necessarily interpreted in the Chaldee language, which they had lately learned: as when Ezra the scribe brought the book of the Law before the congregation, the Levites "read in the book, in he Law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading;" Neh. viii. 8. Hence at last arose a Chaldee Translation of the Old Testament, to be read every Sabbath in the Synagogue, which being not literal, but accompanied with a brief exposition, took in, with the text, the general opinion of the learned Jews. And thus not only the *doctrine* but the *name* of the Messias became very frequent and familiar with them. In the Chaldee

---

like himself? Were the prophecies and promises in the Old Testament concerning the Messias numerous? Were they so explicit as to account without any difficulty for the universal expectation of the Jews on this subject? "And after threescore and two weeks shall *Messiah* be *cut off*, &c." Dan. ix. 26. What is there *peculiar* in the application of this passage? 114. How do we account for the familiarity of the Jews, subsequently to the Babylonish captivity,

paraphrase now extant, the Messias is expressly mentioned in above seventy places besides that of Daniel.—The Jews then, informed by the plain words of Daniel, instructed by a constant interpretation of the Law and the Prophets, relying on the infallible predictions and promises of God, unanimousiy expected out of their own nation, of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David, a *Messias* or *Christ* to come.

115. III. To prove that the *Messias* promised to the Jews is already come.

116. 1. Jacob on his death bed predicted, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and to him shall the gathering of the people be;" Gen. xlix. 10. But the sceptre is departed from Judah, nor is there a lawgiver left between his feet: *Shiloh* therefore is already come. By *Shiloh* is manifestly meant the *Messias;* for (*a*) All the old Paraphrasts expressly call him the *Messias;* and (*b*) The immediately following words of the description speak no less, "to Him shall the gathering of the people be," an explication of His person, office, or condition, who was but darkly described in the name *Shiloh.* For so He signified to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;" Gen. xxii. 18. decyphered in Isaiah, "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, &c. to it shall the Gentiles seek, &c." xi. 10. and in Micah, "The mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established on the top of the mountains, &c. and people shall flow unto it;" iv. 1. And thus the blessing of Judah is plainly

---

with the *doctrine* and *name* of the Messias? On what grounds did they expect His coming? 116. Shew that the Messias is already come from the prediction respecting *Shiloh.* Quote texts, and make requisite remarks.

intelligible; "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; &c. thy father's children shall bow down before thee." Thou shalt obtain the primogeniture of thy brother Reuben, and so rule over the rest of the tribes:.....all thy brethren shall be subject to thee—and this government shall not fail till there come a son of yours far greater than yourself, for His dominion, not like yours confined to the tribes of Israel, shall be universal, and all nations shall serve Him.—Since then *Shiloh* is the *Messias*, and since the government of Israel, of which God promised by Jacob that it should *not* fail till Shiloh came, is failed, the *Messias* is already *come.*

117. 2. The prophet Malachi expressly declared ".....the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in;" iii. 1. And Haggai, yet more clearly, "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts,.... I will shake the heavens, &c. &c. and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former;" Hag. ii. 6. &c. Evidently then the Messias was to come while the second Temple stood; as certainly it is not now standing; Therefore *He is* already *come.* The only *possible* objection is that these prophecies do not relate to the Messiah. But the *ancient* Jews confessed that they *did;* and undeniably they do so. *For* (*a*) *The angel of the covenant, the delight of the Israelites, the desire of all nations,* are certain and known characters of the Christ to come. And (*b*) It cannot be conceived how the glory of the second Temple should exceed that of the first but by the coming of the Messiah to

---

117. Shew the same from prophecies respecting the coming of the *Messias* to the second Temple, and the

it. i. For the Jews themselves have observed that five signs of the Divine glory present in the first Temple were wanting to the second : *α.* The Urim and Thummim, by which the high-priest was miraculously instructed of the will of God ; *β.* The Ark of the covenant, whence God gave clear and audible answers : *γ.* The Fire on the Altar, which came down from heaven and immediately consumed the sacrifice ; *δ.* The Divine presence or habitation with them represented by a visible appearance, or given, as it were, to the king and high-priest by the anointing with the oil of unction ; and *ε.* The spirit of Prophecy. ii. And in the beauty and glory of the *structure* itself there was no comparison. "For many.....who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of *this* house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice ;" Ezra iii. 12. And the prophecy above quoted from Haggai is introduced with the question, "who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory ? and how do ye see it now ? is it not.....in comparison .....as nothing ?"—The glory of the second Temple therefore can no other way be imagined *greater*, than by the coming of Him into it in whom all those signs of the Divine glory before enumerated were far more eminently contained. And this Person alone is the Messiah. For He was to be the glory of the people Israel, yea, of the God of Israel ; *α.* He the *Urim and Thummim*, by whom as by a greater oracle the will of God was revealed ; *β.* He the true *Ark of the Covenant*, the only Propitiatory by His blood ; *γ.* He who was to baptize with the Holy Ghost

---

glory of the second Temple above that of the first. Quote texts ; and shew in what manner these prophecies were fulfilled.

and with the true *Fire which came down from heaven;* δ. He who was to *inhabit* our flesh and *dwell* among us that we might *behold* His *glory;* ε. He who received the *Spirit* without measure, and from whose fulness we all receive. Therefore *His* coming to the *second* Temple was the *sufficient* and *only* means by which *its* glory could be *greater* than that of the *first.*—If then the *Messias* were Divinely predicted to come while the second Temple stood, if that Temple hath long ceased to be, if it were before its destruction to be in greater glory than ever the former was, and if no such glory could accrue to it but by the coming of the *Messias,*—then *is* that *Messias already come.*

118. IV. To demonstrate *Jesus to be that Messias.*

119. 1. (*a*) Both Jew and Gentile acknowledge that this *Jesus* was born, lived, and died, in Judæa, before the commonwealth of Israel was dispersed, before the second Temple was destroyed; *i. e.* at the very time when the Prophets foretold the Messias should come: (*b*) and *no other* did with any show of probability pretend to be, or was accepted as, the Messias.—Therefore *Jesus* was the *Christ.*

120. 2. All other prophecies belonging to the *Messias* were fulfilled in *Jesus,* and in no one else, whether we look on the (*a*) Family, (*b*) Place, or (*c*) Manner, of His birth.—(*a*) That He was to come of the tribe of *Judah* and *family* of *David* is every where manifest.—i. α. The Jews who mention (*one*) Messias as a son of *Joseph* or *Ephraim* do not deny, but rather dignify, (the *other*) the son of *David* or of *Judah* whom they

---

119. How did the time of *our Saviour's* coming correspond with the period assigned by the Prophets for that of the *Messias*? 120. Shew that the prophecies relating

confess to be the *greater* Christ.* β. "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, &c." Isai. xi. 1. "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, &c." ver. 10. γ. Now of whom but *Jesus* spake the Elders, "Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David?" Rev. v. 5. Who but He said, "I am the root and offspring of David, &c." xxii. 16. δ. The Jews all acknowledged it; as appears by our Saviour's question, "How say the scribes that *Christ*† is the Son of *David?*" Mark xii. 35. "What think ye of *Christ?* Whose Son is He? They say unto Him, The Son of *David;*" Matt. xxii. 42. and that of the people amazed at the cure of the blind and dumb, "Is not this the Son of David?" Matt. xii. 23. The blind cried out to Him, "Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on us!" Matt. xx. 31. the multitude, "Hosanna to the son of David!" xxi. 9. ii. The genealogy of Jesus shews His family;....."The book of the generation of Jesus Christ the Son of David;" Matt. i. 1.—The prophecy therefore was certainly fulfilled in respect of His *lineage;* for "it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah;" Heb. vii. 14—(*b*) Jesus was born at the *Place* where the *Messias* was to be born. i. *a.* When Herod demanded of the chief priests where Christ should be born, they answered, "in Bethlehem of Judæa;" Matt. ii. 4, 5. β. "Shall Christ come out of *Galilee?*" John vii. 41. said people doubting whether *Jesus* was the Christ because they

---

to the *Family, Place,* and *Manner,* of the birth of the *Messias,* were fulfilled in *Jesus.* Quote texts, &c. What

* The Jews have invented a double Messias, attributing to *one* all those places which mention His low estate and sufferings—to the *other* such as speak of His power and glory.

† Rather "*The Christ.*" On the originally appellative signification of the word "Christ," and its subsequent use as a proper name, see Campbell's Prelim. Dis. V. and Rose's Parkhurst's Lexicon *sub voce.* G.

thought *He* had been born *there*: "Hath not the Scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of *David*, and out of the town of *Bethlehem* where David was?" γ. The passage they meant was cited by the scribes to Herod according to the interpretation then current among the Jews, and still preserved in the Chaldee paraphrase;..... "And thou, Bethlehem in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah, for out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule My people Israel." ii. A prediction remarkably fulfilled in the birth of Jesus, when by Divine providence Augustus ordering the taxing of the world, and every one being for that end required to go into his own city, Joseph and Mary accordingly went from Nazareth of Galilee to Bethlehem of Judæa, the city of David, there to be taxed, because they were of the house and lineage of David, Luke ii. 4. and while they were there, the days of the Virgin Mary being accomplished, she brought forth her first born Son; and so "unto us was born in the city of David a Saviour which is Christ the Lord;" ii. 11.—(c) As to the *Manner* of the birth of *Jesus*;—i. Isaiah spake thus to the house of David; "The Lord Himself shall give you a sign: Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call His name *Immanuel*:" vii. 14. What nativity could better suit the greatness of a *Messias* than this, most miraculous, of a Virgin? What name fitter for him than *Immanuel*, *God with us*, whose land Judæa is said to be? Isai. viii. 8. The *Immanuel* then thus born was unquestionably the true *Messias*. ii. And *Jesus was* thus born of the Virgin Mary, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet;" Matt.

---

figment have the Jews invented as to a *double* Messias?

i. 22.—Wherefore all the prophecies concerning the Family, Place, and Manner, of the *birth* of the *Messias* being fulfilled in *Jesus*, and *not* even pretended to be accomplished *in any other*, manifestly *Jesus* is the *Christ*.

121. 3. He who *(a) taught*, (*b*) *did*, (*c*) *suffered*, what the Messias was to *teach*, *do*, *suffer*, and (*d*) by suffering *obtained* all which a *Messias* could *obtain*, must be the true *Messias*. But all this is manifestly true of *Jesus*.

122. (*a*) i. The *Messias* was promised as a Prophet and *Teacher* of the people. So God promised Him to Moses, "I will raise them up a Prophet, &c." So Isaiah, Hosea, Ezekiel, have expressed Him; as will be shewn hereafter. And also as a greater Prophet and more perfect doctor than any before Him. "I have put My Spirit upon Him," saith God; "He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, &c." Isai. xlii. 1, 4. ii. Now *Jesus* of Nazareth *was* the most perfect Prophet, the Prince of all prophets, &c. before or after Him. For He hath revealed to us the most perfect will of God both in His precepts and promises. He hath delivered it in the most perfect manner, with the greatest authority, not like Moses and the Prophets saying, "Thus saith the Lord," but "I say unto you," not like the interpreters of Moses, for "He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes:" Matt. vii. 29; with the greatest perspicuity, not under types and shadows; with the greatest universality, as preaching that Gospel which is to unite all nations as one fold under one shepherd.—Whatsoever then the *Messias* was to *teach*, *Jesus* taught; and therefore is *Christ*.

---

122. Shew that in excellency, authority, &c. of *teaching*, *Jesus* eminently fulfilled what was predicted of the *Messias* as a *Teacher*. Quote texts.

123. (*b*) i. When John the Baptist had heard "the *works* of Christ, he sent two of his disciples" to ask, "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" And Jesus alleged those very *works* as a sufficient resolution of the question, "Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, &c," Matt. xi. 2. &c. Those Jews also acknowledged Jesus' *works* as a sufficient testimony that He was the *Messias*, who said, "When Christ cometh, will He do more miracles than those which this man doth?" John vii. 31. Nicodemus confessed little less; "Rabbi, we know that Thou art a Teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that Thou doest, except God be with Him;" John iii. 2. The miracles, great and many as they are, wrought by *Moses and the Prophets* in *above* 3000 *years*, are *far short* of those which this *one Jesus* performed *within three years*, *few* in respect of those *written* of our Saviour, *inconsiderable* if compared with *all* which He *wrought*....." there are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written;" John xxi. 25.—ii. Our Saviour excelled all others also in the *power* of His working. Whatsoever miracles Moses wrought, he received from God by way of command, or in answer to prayer; the power therefore was not *inherent* in *him;* whereas it *was* so in *Jesus*, in whom "dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" Col. ii. 9. and to whom "the Father had given to

---

123. Shew from the *great number* of *miracles* wrought by *Jesus*, and from the *nature* of His *miraculous power*, that *He* eminently *did* all which the *Messias* could be expected to do. Quote texts.

have life in Himself;" John v. 26. This He shewed by working with a word, commanding the winds to be still, the devils to fly, the dead to rise; by working without word or sign, as when the woman was healed of her issue of blood by touching His garment; Mark v. 25, 29. So also we find that "the men of Gennesaret, the people out of all Judea and Jerusalem, &c." even "the whole multitude sought to touch Him, for there went virtue out of Him, and healed them all;" Matt. xiv.; Luke vi. Once indeed Christ seems to have prayed, before the raising of Lazarus; but this was merely "because of the people that stood by;" John xi. 42. not that He had not power in Himself to raise Lazarus, but, "that they might believe that the Father had sent Him." The *inherency* of the power in Jesus is manifest from His ability to communicate it at His pleasure, and His actual conferring it;—on His disciples, "I give unto you power to tread on serpents, &c." Luke x. 19.—on the Apostles, "Heal the sick, &c. freely ye have received, freely give;" Matt. x. 8.—on the first believers, "These signs shall follow them that believe; in My name they shall cast out devils;" Mark xvi. 17. "He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works, &c." John xiv. 12.—*He* then who i. did *more miracles*, and ii. in a *manner far more divine*, than Moses and all the Prophets, hath *done* all which the *Messias* could be expected to do.

124. (*c*) *Jesus* hath *suffered* all which the Messias was to suffer. For we must not with the Jews deny a *suffering* Christ, or invent one Messias to suffer, another to reign. It is clear from Isaiah what His condition was to be whom he calls

---

124. Shew that *Jesus* both in the *contempt* He met with through *life*, and in His undergoing of *death* with preceding

"servant of God;" lii. 13. and the ancient Jews constantly understood that place of the Messias.—The sufferings of Christ spoken of by the prophet may be reduced to two parts: i. the contempt in which He was held of men, and ii. His death with its preceding indignities and pains. i. For the first part the prophet hath punctually described His condition; "He hath no form nor comeliness, &c. He is despised and rejected of men;" liii. 2 3. The most ancient writers have interpreted Isaiah to signify that our Saviour's *bodily* aspect was uncomely; But as to His outward appearance the Scriptures are silent; it is enough that we are assured His state and condition were inglorious in the eyes of the Jews. For though, "being in the form of God, He thought it not robbery to be equal with God, yet He made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant;" Phil. ii. 6. For thirty years He lived with His mother, and reputed father, of a mean profession, "subject to them;" Luke ii. 51. After that, having entered on His prophetical office, He passed from place to place, sometimes received into a house, sometimes lodging in the field, for ".....the Son of man had not where to lay His head;" Matt. viii. 20. Hence arose in the Jews a neglect of His works and contempt of His doctrine. "Is not this the carpenter's son?" Matt. xiii. 55. nay further, ".....the carpenter, the son of Mary? And they were offended at Him;" Mark vi. 3. Thus was He "despised and rejected of men, and they esteemed Him not."—ii. This contempt was by degrees raised to hatred, detestation, and persecution, to a cruel and ignominious death. Regarding

---

indignities and *pains*, *suffered* all which the *Messias* was to suffer. Quote texts, and make requisite remarks.

all which in *general*, He was in the highest degree "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." But from the *particular* predictions compared with the historical passages of His sufferings, it will be most manifest, the *Messias* was to suffer nothing which *Jesus* hath not suffered. *α.* Compare "they weighed for My price thirty pieces of silver;" Zech. xi. 12. with the account of the price for which Judas sold Jesus, Matt. xxvi. 15.—*β.* Isaiah says, "He was wounded," liii. 5. Zechariah "they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced," xii. 10. David more particularly, "they pierced my hands and my feet;" Psal. xxii. 16.—and the Evangelist will shew how He was fastened to the cross, and Jesus Himself "the print of the nails;" John xx. 25. *γ.* The Psalmist tells us they "should laugh Him to scorn, and shake their head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that He would deliver Him; let Him deliver Him, &c." xxii. 7, 8. St Matt. xxvii. 39, 43. describes the same action and the same expression.—*δ.* "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Psal. xxii. 1. saith David; the son of David shews in whose person the father spake it; "Eli, Eli, &c." Matt. xxvii. 46.—*ε.* Isaiah foretells that "He was numbered with the transgressors;" liii. 12. we find Him "crucified between two thieves;" Mark xv. 27.—*ζ.* The Psalmist says, "In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink;" lxix. 21. the Evangelist tells us, "Jesus, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst, and they took a spunge filled with vinegar,.....and gave Him to drink;" Matt. xxvii. 48.—*η.* "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture;" Psal. xxii. 18.; compare the fulfilment of the prediction, when the soldiers took His garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part, and cast lots for His coat without seam; John xix. 23, 24.—*θ.* lastly, the Prophets

teach us, "He shall be brought like a lamb to the slaughter, and be cut off out of the land of the living;" Isai. liii. 7, 8. and all the Evangelists declare how like a lamb He suffered, and the very Jews will acknowledge that He was cut off. "Thus," then "it is written, and thus it behoved the *Christ* to suffer;" Luke xxiv. 46. and what it so behoved *Him* to suffer *Jesus* suffered.

125. (*d*) By His sufferings *Jesus obtained* what the *Messias* was to obtain. α. Isaiah foretold of the Christ, "He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His death;" liii. 9. and as the thieves with whom He was crucified were buried, so was *Jesus*, but laid in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathæa, an honourable counsellor. β. "After two days will He revive us, in the third day He will raise us up," said Hosea vi. 2. of the people of Israel, in his language a type of Christ; xi. 1. and the third day Jesus rose from the dead. γ. "The Lord said unto my Lord," saith David, "Sit Thou at My right hand;" Psal. cx. 1. applicable to *Jesus* who *is*, *not* to *David*, who *is not*, ascended into the heavens; see Acts ii. 34, &c. and so "all the house of Israel might know assuredly that God had made that same *Jesus* whom they crucified both Lord and *Christ*."

126. 4. (*a*) If it were the proper character of the Messias that all nations should come in to serve Him;—(*b*) if the doctrine of *Jesus* has been accordingly preached and received in all parts of the world;—and (*c*) if the doctrine revealed by Him could not possibly have been thus propagated if not Divine,—then must *Jesus* be the *Messias*.

---

125. Shew that *Jesus*, in the fulfilment of prophecies of what should happen to the Messias after his death, *obtained* what the *Messias* was to obtain. 126. On what suppositions do the propagation and reception of the Gospel in the world prove *Jesus* to be the *Christ*?

127. (*a*) That all nations were to come in to the Messias, and so the distinction between Jew and Gentile to cease, is the most universal description in all the prophecies. "Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, &c." Psal. ii. 8. "All kings shall fall down before Him, all nations shall do Him service;" Psal. lxxii. 11. *See* (Isai. ii. 2. *parallel with*) Mic. iv. 1. *and* Isai. xi. 10. (*quoted in par.* 116.) All the prophets delivered from God the same message which Malachi concludes; "From the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, My name shall be great among the Gentiles, &c. &c. saith the Lord of Hosts;" i. 11.—Now since the bounds of Judæa were settled, since the promise of God was to bring in *all nations* at the coming of the Messias, a thing so much opposed by the Jews, jealous for their ancient privilege, *He* who actually wrought this work must be the *Messias*.

128. (*b*) Now all nations *did* thus come in to the doctrine preached by *Jesus*. i. For though *He* was "not *sent* but to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*," Matt. xv. 24. though of the many Israelites who believed on Him in His life few were left just after His death, yet when the Apostles had received commission from Him to teach all nations, and were endued with power from on high by the Holy Ghost, the first day there was an accession of 3000 souls; Acts ii. 41. immediately after, "the number of the men (beside women) was about 5000;" and still "believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women;" v. 14. Dispersed by the persecution of Jerusalem,

---

127. Shew that the conversion of the nations, and the doing away with the religious distinction between Jew and Gentile, were to be accomplished by the *Messias*. 128. Shew that the nations accordingly were converted to the faith of *Jesus*. State some particulars as to the first

they spread the Gospel through the regions of "Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria;" ix. 31. so that St James spake thus to St Paul, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands (*myriads*) of Jews there are which believe;" xxi. 20. How great was the number of believing Jews, strangers, scattered through the Roman provinces, appears from the epistles of St Peter, St James, and St John. ii. And yet all these are nothing to the fulness of the *Gentiles* which came after. *α.* First, such as had before abandoned idolatry, and worshipped the same one true God with the Jews, but refused to be circumcised and so to be bound to keep the whole Law. These were the most easily converted; For they heard the Apostles preach the same God (acknowledged by *themselves*) with Moses, yet teach the abrogation of circumcision and legal ceremonies (which they would not admit); understanding also much of the Old Testament from frequenting the Jewish synagogues, they were of all Gentiles readiest to hear, and ablest to appreciate, the arguments produced by the Apostles from Scripture to prove that *Jesus* was the Christ. Thus many of the "Greeks which came up to worship at Jerusalem," John xii. 20. "devout men out of every nation under heaven," Acts ii. 5. *first* embraced the Christian faith. *β.* After them infinite multitudes of the rest of the Gentiles in a short time received it. How much did *Jesus* work by one, St Paul, to "the obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed!" How did he pass "from Jerusalem round" about through Phœnice, Syria, and Arabia, Asia, Achaia, and Macedonia, even to "Illyricum, fully preaching the Gospel of Christ!"

---

progress of His religion among the Jews, and the Gentiles. Quote texts. When did the Roman empire become professedly Christian? What distinction was observed by the

Rom. xv. 18, 19. How far others; so that he should speak even of *his* time that the "gospel was preached to every creature under heaven!" Col. i. 23. Many nations, innumerable people, received the Faith in the Apostle's days; and not many years after, notwithstanding millions cut off in persecutions, their number equalled half the Roman empire: and little more than two ages after the death of the last Apostle, the Emperors of the world submitted to Christ, that "the Gentiles might come to His light, and Kings to the brightness of His rising;" Isai. lx. 3. that "Kings might become the nursing fathers, &c." of the Church. Isai. xlix. 23.——Thus, according to all the predictions of the Prophets, the one God of Israel was acknowledged throughout the world as the only true God; and the Law given to Israel as His true Law, but given to that people only, and consequently to cease when they ceased to be a people, except the *moral* part of it, given to all men and obliging all; the Heathen oracles ceased, and the idols were rejected, wheresoever Christianity was received. ".....In that day I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land,.....also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land;" Zech. xiii. 2.

129. (*c*) The Gospel could not have been thus received unless Divine. For its *success* can *no way* seem *probable* from i. The *Nature* of the Doctrine: for *a*. It condemned all other religions, though long settled, and under which many states, especially the Roman, had signally flourished; *β*. It contained precepts contrary to the general

---

converts as to the *moral* and the *ceremonial*, &c. parts of the Jewish Law? How did the abolition of the Heathen oracles and idols among the converts correspond with the prophecy?

129. Shew that the reception of the Gospel is not to be

inclination of mankind, as self-denial, love of enemies, &c. γ. It enforced these precepts by promises seemingly incredible and inconceivable, not of good things of this world, but of such as cannot be had till after this life, consequently presupposing what was then thought impossible, a resurrection. δ. It delivered predictions of dangers, afflictions, &c. to such as should embrace it. "All that would live godly in Christ Jesus should suffer persecution;" 2 Tim. iii. 12.—*Nor* from ii. The *Teachers* of it: The first Revealer bred in the house of a carpenter, brought up under no Professor, despised by all the learned in the religion of His nation, in the time of His preaching apprehended, bound, buffeted, &c. betrayed by one disciple, denied by another, &c. "Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumblingblock, and to the Greeks foolishness;" 1 Cor. i. 23. His Apostles of mean birth and profession, and illiterate by education.—*Nor* from iii. The *manner* in which they delivered it: They allured not the world by rhetorical expression or ornaments of eloquence, affected not subtlety of wit or strength of argument for persuasion and conviction, used not force nor corporal threats to compel or affright: but in plain simplicity of words they delivered what they had seen and heard, "preaching, not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit;" 1 Cor. ii. 4.—Therefore it is no way imaginable how the Gospel could have been received as it was, had not the Doctrine been certainly Divine, had not "*Jesus*, the author and finisher of our faith," Heb. xii. 2. been the true *Messias*.

---

accounted for from the *nature* of its *doctrine*, the *personal condition*, &c. of its *teachers*, nor the *manner* of their delivering it. How then alone can it be accounted for?

130. [Summary of arguments under IVth. head.] 1. He who *was in the world at the time* when the *Messias* was to come, and which no other then nor since pretended,—2. who was born of the *family*, at the *place*, in the *manner*, foretold by the prophets of the *Messias*,—3. who *taught*, *did*, *suffered*, *received*, all the *Messias* was to *teach*, &c.—4. whose doctrine was received in all nations according to the character of the *Messias*,—was certainly the true Messias. All these things are exactly fulfilled in *Jesus*, and in Him only: therefore *Jesus* is the *Christ*.

131. V. To declare *what is*, and what are the proper *effects* of, that *unction* by which Jesus is *Christ:* shewing;

132. 1. What offices were to belong to the Messias, as the end and effect of His unction. (*a*) The *Messias* was *typified* as well as foretold. Whosoever were anointed under the Law were so because *He* was to be anointed. Among the Jews were anointed i. *Kings:* "Samuel said unto Saul, The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be *king* over Israel;" 1 Sam xv. 1. See also xvi. 12. Samuel enjoined by God to anoint David:—ii. *High Priests*: whence the Anointed signified the High Priest; See Levit. iv. 3.—And, occasionally, iii. *Prophets*; for "the Lord said unto Elias,... "Elisha the son of Shaphat shalt thou anoint to be *Prophet* in thy room;" 1 Kings xix. 15, 16. It has hence been rightly concluded that the three offices of *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *King*, belonged to *Jesus* as the *Christ*. For the constitution and

---

130. Give a brief summary of the arguments (under IVth head) to prove that *Jesus* was the *Christ*. 132, 133, 136. What are the principal things to be shewn with regard to the *Unction* of the *Messias*, and the fulfilment of them in *Jesus*? 132. Shew that the Messias was to be a *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *King;* by arguments drawn from

administration of the commonwealth of Israel altogether respected the *Messias*. Their constitution was made by a separation of them from all other nations, a separation begun in Abraham with a peculiar promise of a seed (Messias typified by Isaac) in whom all nations should be blessed, and united into one religion; and continued by the administration of that commonwealth, which administration consisted in three functions, *prophetical*, *regal*, *sacerdotal;* all which had respect to the Messias, as the scope of all the Prophets, the Lord of the Temple and the end of all the Temple sacrifices, and the heir of an eternal priesthood "after the order of Melchizedech," and of the throne of David as an everlasting kingdom..... From these considerations it follows that the three functions just mentioned were to be united in the *Messias*, and consequently, that the *Christ* was to be *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *King*.—(*b*)Again, the Redemption or Salvation to be brought by the Messias consists in the freeing a sinner from the state of sin and eternal death into a state of righteousness and eternal life. Now a freedom from sin, in respect of the *guilt*, requires a sacrifice propitiatory, therefore a *Priest;* in respect of the *dominion*, requires a revelation of the will of God and of His wrath against all ungodliness, therefore a *Prophet;* and a *translation* from a state of *death* to eternal *life* requires absolute authority and irresistible power, therefore a *King*. The Messias then, the Redeemer of Israel, was anointed to become *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *King*

133. 2. That *Jesus* was accordingly as the Messias anointed to these offices, and fully performs

---

the *typical* usage of *unction* among the *Jews*, also from the *offices* which it was necessary for the promised *Redeemer* to sustain for *effecting* the *salvation* of *sinners*. 133. Shew that *Jesus*, as the Messias, was anointed to the *Prophetical*

them.—A. *Jesus* was anointed to the *Prophetical* office. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the Gospel to the poor;" Isai. lxi. 1. a prediction which our Saviour declared to be "this day fulfilled in your ears" to His hearers in the synagogue of Nazareth, who all "bare Him witness, &c." Luke iv. 21, 22. And we have yet more ample proof from His (*a*) *Preparation*, (*b*) *Mission*, (*c*) *Administration*, that He fully performed this office.—(*a*) *α*. If Jeremiah, sanctified of God and ordained a Prophet before he came out of the womb, Jer. i. 5. *β*. and John the Baptist, "filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb," Luke i. 15. thus became singular Prophets, how much more eminent was *His* prophetical *Preparation*, to whose mother it was said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;" Luke i. 35. *γ*. If the Levites must be "thirty years old" Numb. iv. 47. on beginning their ministry, *Jesus* will not publicly begin His till He "begin to be about thirty years of age;" Then (unparalleled inauguration) doth "the Holy Ghost descend.....like a dove upon Him, and a voice from Heaven declare, This is my beloved Son, &c." Luke iii. 22, 23.—(*b*) Never was any *Mission* confirmed so irrefragably as His was by *α*. the formal testimony of John the Baptist, and *β*. the more virtual testimony of His own miracles. *α*. "Behold I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord;" Mal. iv. 5. Accordingly, "John went

---

office, according to prediction; and give the proofs of it derived from His *preparation* for the office, His *mission* to it, and His *administration* of it. In particular, remark, in reference to His *preparation*, circumstances relating to the designation of Jeremiah and John the Baptist to the

before Him in the spirit of Elias;" Luke i. 17. This John or Elias saw the Spirit descend on Jesus, and "bare record that this is the Son of God;" John i. 34. The Jews noticed this testimony, see John iii. 26. and Jesus reminded them, "Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth;" John v. 33. yea, they confessed that....."all things that John spake of this man were true;" John x. 41. But, β. "I have *greater* witness than that of John," saith our Saviour, "for the *works* which My Father hath given Me to finish,.....bear witness of Me, that the Father hath sent Me;" John v. 36. "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not. But if I do, though ye believe not Me, believe the works, &c." John x. 37, 38. Works far exceeding those of Moses and all the Prophets; who asserted *their* Divine Mission by their works.—(*c*) The Prophetical Function consists in the i. *promulgation*, ii. *confirmation*, and iii. *perpetuation*, of the Doctrine containing the will of God for the salvation of man. The perfect *Administration* of this office must be attributed to *Jesus*, who i. *Revealed* the perfect will of God; For "no man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son,.....He hath declared Him;" John i. 18. He gave unto His Apostles the words which His Father gave Him; John xvii. 8, 14. ii. *Confirmed* this Doctrine by a most holy and innocent life, for He "did no sin, &c." 1 Pet. ii. 22., by working most powerful and Divine works, thereby known

---

prophetical office; and to the time when the Levites began their ministry;- name the *two* great testimonies to the Divinity of our Saviour's *mission*;- -and shew how He fully *administered* the Prophetical function in regard to *promulgating*, *confirming*, and *perpetuating*, the doctrine containing the will of God for the salvation of man. Quote texts, &c. throughout.

to be a "teacher from God,"—by dying a most painful and shameful death to ratify it, "witnessing a good confession before Pontius Pilate," 1 Tim. vi. 13. in itself efficacious to that end, and made more evidently operative in the raising of Himself from death ;—iii. *Perpetuated* it, as being no temporary or accidental Prophet, but He who instituted and instructed all who have any relation to that function. For "the Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets ;" 1 Pet. i. 11. and "when He ascended up on high,.....He gave some Apostles and some Prophets, &c. for the perfecting of the saints, &c." Eph. iv. 8. &c.—*Jesus* then was *Christ* in that He was anointed to the *Prophetical* office, which He most fully performed : [(*a*) (*b*) (*c*).]

134. B. *Jesus* was anointed, as with the unction of Elisha to the Prophetical, so with that of Aaron to the *Sacerdotal* office. Not that He was called after the order of Aaron—"our Lord sprang out of *Judah*, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood ;" Heb. vii. 14, 21.—but after a more ancient order, ".....a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedech ;" Psal. cx. 4. Yet whatsoever Aaron did as a Priest was wholly typical, consequently to be fulfilled in the Messias as He was a Priest. For the priesthood did *not begin* in *Aaron*.....We read of "the priests which came near to the Lord ;" Exod. xix. 22., of "young men of the children of Israel which offered burnt-offerings, &c." xxiv. 5. without question *the first-born*, to whom the priesthood did belong. *Jesus* therefore, as the First-begotten of God, was by right a Priest, and being anointed

---

134. Shew that *Jesus*, as the Messias, was anointed to the *Sacerdotal* office. After what *order* ? To whom among the Jews did the priesthood belong before the consecration

to that office performed every function of it by (*a*) *Oblation*, (*b*) *Intercession*, (*c*) *Benediction*,—(*a*) "Every high priest is ordained to *offer* gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man" *Jesus*, if a High Priest, "have somewhat also to offer;" Heb. viii. 3. Not that He had anything to offer beside Himself, who, "when He, cometh into the world, saith, sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast Thou prepared me;" Heb. x. 5. and "by the offering of this *body* of Jesus Christ are we sanctified;" ver. 10. He, our Priest, hath "given Himself an offering and a sacrifice to God, &c." Eph. v. 2.—(*b*) *Jesus* .....makes constant and prevalent *Intercession*. "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us;" Rom. viii. 34. "He is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them;" Heb. vii. 25. not a servile or precarious, but an efficacious and glorious intercession, as of Him to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth.—(*c*) As to *Benediction*. "Aaron was separated.....to burn incense before the Lord,.....and to *bless* in His name for ever;" 1 Chron. xxiii. 13. *Blessing* (and that in respect both of God and man) is the only sacerdotal act recorded of Melchizedech, Priest of the Most High God, who said, "Blessed be Abram of the Most High God, &c. Blessed be the Most High God, &c." Gen. xiv. 19, 20. The doctrine of *Jesus* in the Mount begins with "Blessed;"—on leaving His Disciples "He lift up His hands and

---

of Aaron? Shew that *Jesus* fulfilled the office of a *Priest* in regard to *oblation, intercession, benediction*. Quote texts, &c.

blessed them ;" Luke xxiv. 50. and, to mention the principal performance of this function, "..... God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to *bless* you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities ;" Acts iii. 26.—*Jesus* then [(*a*) (*b*) (*c*)] is a most true and perfect *Priest*.

135. C. The *Messias* was to be a *King*, as appears from the most ancient tradition of the Jews, and by express predictions of the prophets. "Yet have I set My king upon My holy hill of Sion ;" Psal. ii. 6. "Unto us a child is born,.....and the government shall be upon his shoulder," saith Isaiah, who calls Him "the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David, &c." ix. 6., &c. Unerringly interpreted as belonging to *Jesus*, by the angel Gabriel, who promised the blessed Virgin that "God should give to her Son the throne of His Father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, &c." Luke i. 32, 33. He Himself acknowledgeth this office ; strangely, by riding on an ass, but thus it was "fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet, Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy king cometh .....sitting on an ass ;" Matt. xxi. 4, 5. He as strangely confessed it to Pilate, who asked him, "Art thou a king then ? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, ...that I should bear witness unto the truth ;" John xviii. 37. Though by right a King before, His solemn inauguration into this office was "when God raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, &c."

---

135. Shew that *Jesus*, as the *Messias*, was anointed to be a *King*, quoting texts, &c. In what respects does He exercise His Regal office in reference to His own people ? and to His enemies ? What are His enemies ?

Eph. i. 20, 21,——This His Regal office consists (*a*) In *ruling, protecting,* and *rewarding, His own people*; i. *Ruling* them, by delivering them a law to walk by, and by enabling them by His grace to walk in it; ii. *Protecting* them, by helping them to subdue the lusts which reign in their mortal bodies, by preserving them from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, by supporting them in all afflictions, by delivering them from all enemies; iii. *Rewarding* them, hereafter, most royally, making them "kings and priests unto God and His Father;" Rev. i. 6.—(*b*) In *destroying His enemies; a.* whether *Temporal*, as the Jews and Romans, who joined in his crucifixion: while on earth He told His disciples, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom;" Matt. xvi. 28. and therein He was seen to come when He brought destruction on the Jews by the Roman armies, not long after to be destroyed themselves;—*β.* or *Spiritual*, as all wicked men; "Those Mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before Me;" Luke xix. 27. Thus *Sin, Satan,* and *Death*, being the enemies of His kingdom, shall all be destroyed in their order. "For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet; and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death;" 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26.—Thus is *Jesus* become "Prince of the kings of the earth;" thus is the "Lamb" acknowledged "Lord of lords, and *King* of kings;" Rev. i. 5. and xvii. 14.

136. 3. *How Jesus* was anointed to the offices belonging to the Messias.—They who under the

---

136. How were they who under the Law were types of the Messias anointed to their offices? How does it

Law were the types of the Messias were anointed to their offices by the pouring on their bodies of a certain oil which God appointed to be made, and appropriated it to that use. But *that* oil was lost long before our Saviour's birth, the custom of so anointing had long ceased, nor do we read that Jesus was anointed at all with oil. How then was He anointed, and with what, so as to answer to the former unctions, and material, but typical oil?

137. The Jews tell us the anointing oil was hid in the days of Josiah, and shall be produced again when the Messias comes, that He may be anointed with it, &c. But the Christ to come needed no such unction for His consecration, the typical and correspondent oil differing as greatly as the representing and represented Christ. David calls it not by the vulgar name of oil of *unction*, but of "*gladness*;" Psal. xlv. 7. For though that place may be first understood of Solomon, at whose anointing ".....the people rejoiced with great joy, &c." 1 Kings i. 39, 40. yet since the words "Thy God hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness, &c." are spoken *to* God as well as *of* God, ("therefore, God,* Thy God,") the oil with which that God is anointed must in the highest and ultimate sense signify a far greater gladness than that at Solomon's coronation.....

---

appear that the same *material* unction was not that whereby *Jesus* was anointed to the office of the Messias? 137. What do the Jews say of the future finding, &c. of their lost anointing oil? Why no such need of it as they suppose? What does David call the oil used for the consecration of the *Messias*?

* Pearson (quoting Jerome) takes *this* word to be in the *vocative* case.

138. The Ancients tell us that this oil is the Divinity itself; and in Scripture language it is *the Holy Ghost.* "God," saith St Peter, "anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power;" Acts x. 38. The *Spirit* is unquestionably the *oil;* yet there is some doubt *when* Jesus was anointed with it. i. For the angel said unto the blessed Virgin, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: &c." Luke i. 35. Whence it appears, that from the *conception* Jesus was sanctified by the Holy Ghost and the power of the Highest, consequently *then* "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power."—ii. Again, after He was thirty years of age, "the Spirit like a Dove descended and lighted upon Him," and He descending "in the power of the Spirit into Galilee," said to them of Nazareth, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears," *i. e.* "the Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the Gospel;" Isai. lxi. 1. Hence it has been inferred that His unction was performed at His *Baptism.*—Both conclusions consistent. i. David, the most undoubted type of the Messias, was anointed at *Bethlehem* by Samuel, "and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward;" 1 Sam. xvi. 13. the unction necessarily referred to, Psal. lxxxix. 20. "I have found David My servant; with My holy oil have I anointed him." ii. Yet he was *again* anointed at *Hebron,* first "over the house of Judah," then over "all the tribes of Israel;" 2 Sam. ii. 4. and v. 3. As therefore David was

---

138. What in *Scripture* language is the true *oil* wherewith the *Messias* was to be anointed? On what *two* special occasions was *Jesus* anointed therewith? Compare the correspondency of anointings at *different times* in the case of David, the type of the Messias. Quote texts, &c.

anointed both i. when he received a right, not yet to be exercised, to the throne, and ii. again when he actually entered on his regal office, so *Jesus*, the Son of David, was i. *first* sanctified and anointed with the Holy Ghost at His *conception*, and thereby received a right to, and was prepared for, all offices belonging to the Redeemer of the world ; ii. but when He was to enter on the actual and full performance of them, *then* doth the same Spirit visibly descend on Him at His *Inauguration*. And that most properly on His baptism, because among those ancient nations washing customarily preceded unction.

139. The Effusion or Action of the Spirit, whereby *Jesus* was anointed, eminently contains whatsoever the Jews have imagined to be performed or signified by those legal anointings. Why God commanded the use of such anointing oil they give two very good reasons in respect of the *action* : (*a*) To signify the Divine election of that person, and designation to that office ; whence it was necessarily performed by a *Prophet*. Now there could be no such infallible sign of the Divine designation of *Jesus* to His offices as the visible descent of the Spirit, attended with a voice from heaven, instead of the hand of a prophet, saying, "This is my beloved Son, &c."—(*b*) To make the person anointed fit to receive the Divine influx. Now this Spiritual unction of *Jesus* was the very *Divine influx*, nay the Divinity itself, the Godhead dwelling in Him bodily.—In respect of the *matter* they give two causes for the use of oil : (*a*) Because of all liquors it signifies the greatest glory and excellency. The olive was the first of

---

139. Shew that in the sundry particulars required by the Jews themselves to complete their legal unctions, *Jesus* was *eminently* and *properly anointed* with the *Spirit* of

trees mentioned as fit for sovereignty, in regard of its "fatness, wherewith they honoured God and man;" Judges ix. 9. therefore consecration by oil was the best sign of election to honour. And can there be a greater honour than to be the "beloved Son of God," as *Jesus* was proclaimed at this unction, by which He was consecrated to such an office as obtains Him a name far above all names?—(*b*) They tell us oil continues uncorrupted longer than any other liquor: And indeed it has been observed to preserve other things from corruption. Hence they concluded it fit that their kings and priests, whose succession was to continue for ever, should be anointed with oil, as the most proper emblem of eternity. But by this reason of their own their unction is ceased; the succession of their kings and priests being long cut off, and their oil lost long before; and only that one *Jesus*, who was anointed with the most spiritual oil, "continueth for ever," and therefore "hath an unchangeable Priesthood," as being "made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life;" Heb. vii. 24, 26.—*α*. Beside, they observe that simple oil was sufficient for the candlestick, but that designed for unction must be compounded with principal spices, which signify a good name, to be acquired by persons in dignified places by laudable actions. And certainly never was such an admixtion of spices as in the unction of our Saviour, by which He was endued with all variety of the graces of God, by which He was enabled to "offer Himself a sacrifice for a sweet smelling savour;" Eph. v. 2. For as "He was full of grace and truth:" so "of His fulness have we all received, grace for grace;" John i. 14, 16. and as we "have received anointing of Him;" 1 John ii. 27. so we "are unto God a sweet savour of Christ;" 2 Cor. ii. 15.—*β*. Again, it was sufficient to anoint the

---

God: especially with regard to the reasons assigned by them for the use of oil, in respect of the *action* and the *matter* of the legal unctions.

vessels of the sanctuary in *any* part, but oil was to be poured on the *Head* of Kings and Priests, as the seat of all the animal faculties, fountain of all dignity, and original of all the members of the body. Eminently fulfilled in *Jesus*, who by His unction became the "Head of the Church," nay, "the Head of all principality and power, from which all the body. ... having nourishment ministered, &c. increaseth with the increase of God;" Col. ii. 10, 19. —γ. Lastly, they observe that though in the vessels nothing but a single unction was required, yet in the kings and priests were practised both *unction* and *affusion*: ("He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head and anointed him to sanctify him;" Lev. viii. 12.) the first to signify their *separation*, the second to assure them of the *falling of the Spirit upon them*. Now *Jesus* was anointed by *affusion*, whether we regard His *conception*, "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee;" or His *inauguration*, "the Spirit descended and lighted upon Him."————And thus, according to all particulars required by the Jews themselves to complete their legal unctions, *Jesus* was, as most *eminently*, so most *properly anointed* with the *Spirit* of *God*.

Practical uses of Belief in Jesus as Christ.

140. This belief is necessary, (*a*) Because Jesus could not be *our Jesus*, unless he were the *Christ*. For He could not *reveal* the way of salvation unless He were a *Prophet*, nor *work out* that salvation unless a *Priest*, nor *confer* it on us unless a *King*; could not be *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *King*, unless the *Christ*. This was the fundamental doctrine which the Apostles both testified and proved out of the Law and the Prophets. We find St Paul at Thessalonica "three sabbath-days, reasoning with them out of the Scripture, opening, &c. that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that this *Jesus* whom I preach unto you is *Christ*;" Acts xvii. 2, 3.—at Corinth, "pressed in spirit, and testifying to the Jews that *Jesus* was *Christ*;" Acts xviii. 5. Thus Apollos....."mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that *Jesus* was *Christ*;" Acts xviii. 28. This was at first the touchstone

---

140. What are the practical uses of belief in Jesus as *Christ*? Quote requisite texts. 140. *b*. Name some

to distinguish between Christian and Anti-Christian. "For whosoever believeth that *Jesus* is the *Christ* is born of God," 1 John v. 1; "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This man is the Anti-Christ, &c." 1 John ii. 22. (*b*) Because of its necessary influence on our conversations; which influence if it has not, it cannot be clearly maintained. It is most absurd while pretending to demonstrate a truth as infallible to show it impossible; as every one does who professes faith in Christ as come, and lives not according to that profession. We demonstrate to the Jews that our Saviour, who did and suffered so much, is the true *Messias*, but by our lives we recall our arguments, &c. For there certainly was a promise that when Christ should come, "the wolf should dwell with the lamb, &c." Isai. xi. 6. *i. e.* there should be so much love, &c. in the kingdom of Christ, that all ferity being laid aside, the most different natures and inclinations should come to the sweetest agreement. Whereas we must confess there never was more bitterness of spirit, more rancour of malice, heat of contention, &c. than in those who profess the Christian faith. It was infallibly foretold that "when the law should go forth out of Zion, &c. they should beat their swords into ploughshares, &c. neither should they learn war any more;" Isai. ii. 3, 4. Whereas no other art is so much studied, applauded, asserted, not only as lawful, but necessary. Look upon the face of Christendom, &c. It was likewise prophesied of the days of the Messias that all idolatry should cease, all false teachers be cut off, all unclean spirits restrained. Zech. xiii. 2. Can the Jews, who abhor image worship, be persuaded there is no idolatry committed in the Christian Church? Can we at all excuse ourselves from that plague of locusts, the false teachers? Can so many schisms, sects, heresies, arise and spread, without false prophets and unclean spirits? . . Let us remember what we profess, that *Jesus* is the *Christ*, that the kingdom of the *Messias* cannot consist with these impieties. (*c*) In respect of the *offices* belonging to Jesus as *Christ*. i. We must look on Him as the *Prophet* anointed by God that we may be incited to hear and embrace His doctrine. Though Moses and Elias be with Him in the Mount, yet the voice from heaven

---

notorious errors in belief and practice among Christians which expose their profession to the objection of Jewish

speaketh of none other, "Hear ye *Him*," Matt. xvii. 5; He is that Wisdom, the "delight of God," crying, "Blessed is the man that heareth Me, &c." Prov. viii. 34. "There is one thing needful;" saith our Saviour; "and Mary chose that good part, who sat at Jesus' feet, and heard His word," Luke x. 42, 39.; which posture teaches us willingness to hear, readiness to obey; the proper effect of this prophetical office in us is our "obedience of faith;" Rom. xvi. 26. ii. To add *confidence* to obedience we must consider Him as our High *Priest*. For we have "boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus; yea, having a High Priest over the house of God, we may draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith;" Heb. x. 19, 21, 22. *Resignation* also is thus required of us: for if Christ have redeemed us, we are His; if He died for us, it was that we should live unto Him. See 1 Cor. vi. 20. iii. Again we must apprehend Him as our *King*, that we may perform our true and entire allegiance to Him. As soon as He let the Apostles understand that "all power was given unto Him in heaven and in earth," He charged them to "teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever He commanded them;" Matt. xxviii. 18, 20. Would He strictly enjoin subjection to "higher powers," Rom. xiii. 1., here below, and not expect exact obedience to Him Who is exalted "far above all principalities and powers, &c.?" Eph. i. 21. "The King shall say to them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you;" Matt. xxv. 34. which title, as it secures hope in respect of His power, and magnifies our reward by the excellency of our inheritance, so also teaches us the indispensable condition of *obedience*. (*d*) To instruct us what it is to be a Christian, and how far we stand obliged under that name. They who first embraced the faith were styled *Disciples*, *Believers*, *Brethren*, *Men of the Church*, *Men of the way*; by their enemies *Nazarenes* and *Galileans*. But in a short time they from *Christ* were called *Christians* - "first at Antioch;" Acts xi. 26. St Luke thought fit to mention the city in which that honourable name was first heard; a name immediately embraced by all believers, as most properly signifying

---

opponents. 140. *d*. What were the principal names by which the early converts to Christianity were called? Whence were they first called *Christians*?

their profession, and relation to their Author and Master; and in which they so much delighted, that before their enemies they would own no other title, though .. ...martyred for it. A name of not greater honour than obligation. "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity;" 2 Tim. ii. 19. It was a common answer of the ancient martyrs, "I am a Christian, and with us no evil is done." The very name was thought to speak something of emendation. And except such reformation accompany our profession, there is no advantage in the name, nor can we be honoured by it while we dishonour Him who gives it. If He be called *Christ* because *Anointed*, as we derive the name of *Christian*, so do we receive our *unction*, from Him. For as "the precious ointment upon the head ran down upon the beard, &c." Ps. cxxxiii. 2. so the Spirit poured without measure on Christ our Head, is by Him diffused through all the members of His body. For "God hath .. ..anointed us in Christ;" 2 Cor. i. 21. "we have an unction from the Holy one, &c." 1 John ii. 20, 27. – We must then know Jesus to be the *Christ*; because as He is *Jesus*, i.e. our *Saviour*, by being *Christ*, i.e. *anointed*, so we can have no share in Him as *Jesus* unless truly *Christians*, and so in Him as *Christ*, anointed with that unction from the Holy one.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. II. §. 2.

141. I believe as a certain truth that there was a man promised by God, foretold by the Prophets to be the Redeemer of Israel and the expectation of the nations. I am assured by all those predictions that the Messias so promised is already come. I am as certainly persuaded that the man born in the days of Herod of the Virgin Mary, called *Jesus* by an angel from heaven, is that true Messias; that as the Messias He was anointed to *three* special *offices* belonging to Him as the Mediator between God and man; that He was a *Prophet*, revealing to us the whole will of God for the salvation of man; a *Priest*, and hath given Himself a sacrifice for sin, and so made atonement for us; a *King*, set down at God's right hand, far above all principalities, &c. whereby, when He hath subdued all our enemies, He will confer perfect and

---

141. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in Jesus *Christ*.

eternal happiness on us. I believe this unction by which He became the true Messias was not performed by any material oil, but by the *Spirit* of *God*, which He received as the Head, and conveyed to His members. Thus *I believe in Jesus* CHRIST.

ART. II. §. 3. HIS ONLY SON.

142. "The Christ" and the "*Son of God*" were ever inseparable, and even by the Jews accounted equivalent. So Nathanael; "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel;" John i. 49.—Martha; "I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, &c." John xi. 27.—the High-Priest; "I adjure thee.....that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God;" Matt. xxvi. 63.—St Peter; "We believe.....that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God;" John vi. 69. St John wrote his gospel, "that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God;" xx. 31. Certainly then the Jews believed their expected Messias to be the Son of God (though since our Saviour's coming they have denied it); constantly interpreting the second Psalm as appropriated to Him. The primitive Christians included this filial title of our Saviour with His name in one word.* Well, therefore, after acknowledging our Saviour to be *Christ* do we acknowledge Him to be *the only* (in the phrase of Scripture and the Greek Church the *only-begotten*) *Son of God.*

---

142. Quote texts shewing that the Jews accounted "the Christ" to be also the "Son of God." What Scripture did they interpret as attributing this Sonship to their Messias? How did the primitive Christians connect our Saviour's filial title with His names? What in the phrase of Scripture and the Greek Church is the word which we translate *only* in reference to Christ's Sonship?

*ΙΧΘΥΣ; formed from the initials of Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, Σωτὴρ.

143. For the explication of these words it is sufficient to shew, How Christ is the Son of God, and what is the *peculiarity* of *His* generation, so that when *others* are *sons* of God, *He alone* should *so* be *His Son* as *no other can* be, and therefore *alone* be named the *only-begotten*.

144. I. Christ is the son of God;—[in certain senses short of the highest and most peculiar sense]—

145. 1. Because by the Spirit of God born of the Virgin Mary: "for that which is conceived (or begotten) in her is of the Holy Ghost;" Matt. i. 20. and *therefore* the Son of God; "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, &c. therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God;" Luke i. 35.—the Holy Ghost being manifestly God, or our Saviour thus born must have been the son of a creature, not of God.

146. 2. Because Divinely designed to so high an office. Accordingly He Himself argues against the Jews, "Is it not written in your Law, I said, ye are gods? If He"—God, or the Psalmist from Him—"called them gods unto whom the word of God came, (and the Scripture cannot be broken,) say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world"—consecrated and commissioned to the most eminent and extraordinary office—"Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?" John x. 34, &c.

147. 3. Because raised from the dead immediately by God out of the womb of the earth to immortal life. For "God hath fulfilled the promise unto us, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is

---

143. What is required for the explication of the words *His only Son*? 143–148. In what remarkable senses, *short* of the *highest* and *most peculiar* sense, is Christ the Son of God? Quote texts.

also written in the second Psalm, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee ;" Acts xiii. 33. That must be true of Him which was spoken of others, who are "the children of God, being the children of the resurrection ;" Luke xx. 36. He was "appointed the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead ;" Rom. i. 4. Nor is He called simply the *first* that rose, but, with a note of generation, "the *first-born* from the dead ;" Col. i. 18.

148. 4. Because after His resurrection made actually heir of all things in His Father's house, and Lord of all the spirits that minister unto Him. "He is set down at the right hand of the Majesty on high ; being made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they, &c." Heb. i. 3, &c.

149. II. Christ is the Son of God ; (—not only in the senses 1, 2, 3, 4, just stated, but—) in one way more, far more proper in itself, and peculiar to Him, in which no other Son can have the least pretence of share or of similitude, and consequently in respect of which He is the *only-begotten*. To be born of a Virgin is indeed miraculous, and justly entitles Christ to be called *Son of God*, yet places Him not in the singular eminence of the *only-begotten*. The framing Christ out of a woman cannot so far transcend the making Adam (also called *son of God*) out of the earth, as to cause so great a distance as that between the first and second Adam. Beside, many while our Saviour preached on earth believed His doctrine, and confessed Him the *Son of God*, who, probably understood nothing of His being born of a Virgin, much less foresaw His rising

---

149. Shew that to be born of a Virgin would not be sufficient to entitle Christ the *Only-begotten* Son of God.

from the dead or inheriting all things. We now proceed to find *another* generation, by which the same Christ was begotten, consequently a *Son*, *before* He was conceived in the womb of the Virgin; to establish which it shall be proved from Scripture:

150. 1. That *Jesus Christ* had a *real being before He was conceived of the Virgin Mary.* For,

151. A. Jesus Christ was really in heaven, and truly descended thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven or went to the Father; therefore He must have had a real being before He was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her.—(*a*) That He really was in heaven before He ascended thither, appears by His own words to His disciples, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?" John vi. 62. He speaks of a *real* ascension, such as they might *see* as spectators: the place to which it tended was *really* the heaven of heavens: the verb substantive, not otherwise used, sufficiently testifies not a figurative but a *real* being, especially considering the opposition in the word *before;* whether we look on the time of His speaking, or the subsequent time of His ascension, His existing in heaven was *before.*

There is a Socinian explication that "before" refers to a *precious* ascension of Christ before His death: confuted *α.* by want of any written or unwritten testimony; *β.* by want of any foundation in reason; (why

---

149, 150, 160, 176, 177, 178. It being then necessary to find *another* generation by which Christ is Son of God in a *transcendent* and *peculiar* sense, and so rightly styled His *only begotten* Son, what will it be requisite to prove from Scripture, to establish *such* a generation? 151. Shew that Christ really was in heaven, and consequently had a real being, before He was conceived in the Virgin. Confute the

should Christ ascend to heaven, and not be known by [illegible] to know the will of God, which could as well have been revealed to Him on earth? γ. by silence of the Evangelists on what would have been so extraordinary an event; δ. by want of any fitting place in Christ's history for such an occurrence: (would not the [illegible] commission in heaven as Legate of God be inconsistent with His submission to His parents before the time of His public ministry, and make superfluous the descent of the Holy Spirit for His inauguration? after which event, His immediately subsequent temptation there is no opportunity, and thenceforward no pretence of reason for such ascension:) ε. by its inconsistency with Christ's character as High Priest, having entered in *once* and not before *without blood*, i. e. not before His death, into [illegible], i. e. heaven, typically represented by the Holy of Holies made with hands, into which the High Priest alone went once every year. Heb. ix. 12.

Wherefore since Christ ascended not into heaven till after His death, and certainly *was* in heaven *before that* ascension, Jesus Christ was in heaven before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither.—(*b*) Further; as He was there, so He descended thence before He ascended thither. This He often testifies of Himself: "The bread of God is He which came down from heaven;" "I am the living bread which came down from heaven;" John vi. 33, 51. He opposes Himself to the manna in the wilderness, which never was really in heaven; and saith, "I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, &c." vi. 32, 38. Now no person is ever said to descend from heaven but such as were really there before they appeared on earth, as the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the angels: but no man however born, sanctified, &c. is said thereby to descend from thence, but rather when any is opposed to

---

[illegible]inian figment that Christ ascended into heaven before [illegible] death. How are John the Baptist and Adam opposed Christ in Scripture in reference to His *heavenly origin*?

Christ, it is in this very respect. So John the Baptist, "filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb," born of aged parents by God's power.....yet being....."*of the earth* is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; He *that cometh from heaven* is above all;" John iii. 31. and Adam, "the first man," though framed *immediately* by God,....."is *of the earth* earthy; the second man is the Lord *from heaven*;" 1 Cor. xv. 47. The descent therefore of Christ from heaven really presupposes His being there, antecedently to any ascent thither. "That He ascended into heaven, what is it but that He also descended first?" Eph. iv. 9. So St Paul teaches us never to imagine an *ascent* of Christ as His *first* motion between heaven and earth; and consequently, that the first being of Christ was not what He received by His conception on earth, but what He had before in heaven, in respect whereof He was with the Father from whom He came. His disciples believed that He "came out from God;" He asserted, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world;" again, "I leave the world and go to the Father;" John xvi. 27, 28. [*General conclusion:*] Since then Christ was really in heaven, and descended thence, &c. before that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost ascended thither, He had a real being before His conception on earth, and distinct from the being He received here.

152. B. Jesus Christ had not only a bare *priority* of *existence*, but a *pre-existence* of *some* certain *space* of *duration*. For whosoever was before John the Baptist and before Abraham, was some space of time before Christ was made man; but

---

152. Jesus Christ was existent before John the Baptist, and before Abraham. What follows hence?

Jesus Christ was really existent before them, therefore had a real being *some* space of time before He was made man.

153. (*a*) That He was existent before John, John himself testifies; "This is He of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for He was before me;"* John i. 15. Where *α.* after taking to himself a *priority* of *time* with respect to Christ, who came always after John, and at the same distance, into the womb, into the world, unto His office, *β.* he attributes to Christ a *priority* of *dignity*, saying, "He is preferred before me," and reiterating the words with the addition, "whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose;" i. 27. an expression shewing that "to be preferred before him" is the same with being "worthier than he," to which the same expression is constantly added by the other three Evangelists; and *γ.* gives the reason or cause of that great dignity of Christ; "for (rather *because*) He was before me;" which *cause* being necessarily *different* from the *effect*, the priority *last mentioned* cannot be that of *dignity*, and must therefore relate to *time* or *duration*, (as "he was, ἦν, before me," sufficiently signifies,) and so be opposed to His coming after him.

154. (*b*) Further, Christ was also before Abraham. He Himself asserted this pre-existence to the Jews; "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am;" John viii. 58. which words, plainly and literally expounded, must contain this truth. For *α.* Abraham in Scripture never means

---

153. Shew that Jesus Christ was existent before John the Baptist from John's own testimony. 154. Shew from our Saviour's own assertion that He existed before Abraham.

* If this version transposes the meaning (disputed) of the clauses relating to priority, the conclusion is still the same. *G.*

any thing but the person so called, of whom also the question here answered undeniably spake. *β.* Again, Abraham must be the *subject* of the proposition "Abraham was;" for a proposition must have a subject, and if Abraham be the predicate, there is none, *γ.* Again, "Abraham was" must certainly be understood, as we translate, of time *past;* for Christ speaks to the pre-existence of Abraham, and that of long duration, so that whatsoever had concerned his present or future state had been impertinent to the precedent question. *δ.* Lastly, though the expression, "I am," seems somewhat unusual or improper to signify priority in respect of any thing past, yet use (see John xiv. 9. xv. 27. vi. 24.) and the nature of the place necessarily require that it should here denote a priority of existence together with a continuation of it to the present time. Then the words will plainly signify, "Do you question how I, not yet fifty years old, could see Abraham? Verily, &c. before Abraham was born, I had a real being (by which I could see him) in which I have continued till now." In this sense the Jews certainly understood our Saviour's answer, as pertinent, but in their opinion blasphemous, and therefore "they took up stones to cast at Him."—Moreover, they who recede from this literal explication not only pervert the place, but suggest an answer unworthy of and wholly misbecoming Him that spake it. For (setting aside the altogether inadmissible addition of "the light of the world," [a groundless Socinian method of supplying from ver. 12. what they take to be elliptical; see note in Pearson;]) whether they interpret the former

---

(How do the Socinians explain the passage referred to? And why are their modes of so doing inadmissible?)

part, "before Abraham was," of something to come, as the calling of the Gentiles, or the latter, "I am," of a pre-existence in the Divine foreknowledge and appointment,—they represent Christ solemnly asserting, "Verily, &c." what is nothing to the purpose to which He speaks, nor to any other purpose, and the Jews senselessly offended with words which any of *them* might as well have spoken. For the first interpretation makes our Saviour thus to speak, ".....Before Abraham shall perfectly become that which was signified in his name, 'the father of many nations,' before the Gentiles shall come in, *I am.* Nor be ye troubled at this,.....what I speak is as true of you as of me—before Abraham be thus made Abraham, ye are. Doubt not therefore whether I have seen Abraham." The second makes a different, but equally impertinent, sense; "Do ye...ask, Hast thou seen Abraham? Before Abraham was born, I was. But mistake me not, I mean in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I magnify myself in this, for ye were so." Since then the most obvious sense is a proper and full answer to the question, and most likely to exasperate the unbelieving Jews, since those strained explications make the words of Christ impertinent, &c. and since He gave this answer in words of another language, most probably incapable of such interpretation, we must adhere to the literal sense, according to which Christ had a being before Abraham, consequently existed 2000 years before He was born or conceived by the Virgin.

155. C. Jesus Christ's pre-existence extends to a far longer space of time; for He really existed before the flood, nay, at the creation of the world.

---

155. To what far longer space of time does Jesus Christ's pre-existence extend?

156. (*a*) Before the flood: for "Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing;" 1 Pet. iii. 18., &c.* Whence it appears that Christ certainly preached, (by the same Spirit by virtue of which He was raised from the dead, which was not His soul, but something of a greater power,) to those persons who in the days of Noah were disobedient all that time "the long-suffering of God waited," and consequently so long as repentance was offered. And as certainly He never preached to them after they died. He must therefore have preached to them while they lived and were disobedient, for in refusing the mercy offered them by Christ's preaching their disobedience principally consisted. Vainly then are we taught to understand St Peter of the promulgation of the Gospel to the Gentiles after the Holy Ghost descended on the Apostles, for none to whom the Apostles preached could have been disobedient in the days of Noah. The plain interpretation must then be the true, that Christ did preach to those men who lived before the flood, while they lived, and consequently that He was before it. For though this was not done personally by the Son of God, but by the ministry of Noah, "the eighth preacher of

---

156. Shew that He existed before the flood. State and confute a vain mode of interpretation which has been adopted of the passage used for this purpose by Pearson.

* On careful examination of this difficult passage the student will probably not acquiesce in Pearson's interpretation of it. The proof, however, of Christ's pre-existence is complete without the present argument. *G.*

righteousness;" 2 Pet. ii. 5. yet to do any thing by another not able to do it without Him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause as if He did it immediately of Himself.

157. (*b*) At the beginning of the world; for He created it, as the Scriptures abundantly assure us. The same "Son by whom in these last days God spake unto us," Heb. i. 2. is He "by whom also He made the worlds."……The Apostle, shewing greater things have been spoken of Him than ever of any even of the angels, saith, the Scripture spake "unto the Son, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." And not only so, but also, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou remainest:……&c.;" Heb. i. 8, 10., &c. Undeniably the person thus addressed must be the Creator of the world. But these words were spoken to the Son of God, as the Apostle acknowledges, and the whole scope of the chapter, which is to declare the supereminency of Christ, requires. The conjunction *And* refers this place of the Psalmist plainly to the former as equally relating "unto the Son." Nor is it possible to avoid the Apostle's connection by *attributing* the *destruction* of the heavens, out of the *last* words, to the Son, and *denying* the *creation* of them, out of the *first*, to the same……It remains then an undeniable truth that the Son of God created the world. Many passages testify as much, but we have insisted so long on this because of a peculiar nature. For they who deny this truth of the creation of the world by the Son of God have found two ways to elude the force of the Scriptures produced to confirm it: i. if they

---

157. Shew that He existed at the beginning of the world. Quote a passage adduced by Pearson from Heb. i. to prove that the *literal* creation of the world is to be

speak so *literally* of *creation* as not to endure a figurative interpretation, then they try to shew that they are *not spoken* of the *Son of God:* ii. if they speak so *expressly* of *Christ* as not possibly to be applied to any other person, then they represent the *creation* attributed to Him as merely *metaphorical.* ii. Now the place before alleged speaks so *plainly* of the *creation* or *real production* of the world that they never denied it, i. and I have shewn beyond possibility of gainsaying that it is *addressed* to the *Son of God.*

158. Having thus asserted to Christ the creation *acknowledged real*, we shall the more easily persuade that likewise to be such which is *pretended* to be *metaphorical.* We read of the Son of God, "in Whom we have redemption "through His blood;" Col. i. 14. words which cannot be spoken of any but *Jesus Christ. He* it is therefore "who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him. And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist;" Col. i. 15, 16, 17. In which words our Saviour is expressly styled "the first-born of every creature;" *i. e.* begotten by God as the *Son of His Love* (see ver. 13. *original*) before any thing was framed and created by Him; a precedency proved by this undeniable argument, that all other emanations or productions came from Him, and whatsoever received its being by creation was by Him created. Which assertion is delivered in the most proper and full expressions imaginable

---

ascribed to the *Son of God.* Why does he so specially insist on *this* passage? Make any requisite remarks. 158. Col. i. 15, 16, 17. "Who is the image of the invisible God, &c. &c." Give Pearson's exposition of this passage, [which

a. "By Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth;" signifying by the use of the phrase of Moses that the *same creation* is meant. *β.* "visible and invisible," an addition including *immaterial* beings, lest these should seem omitted in Moses' description. *γ.* "whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers," comprehending under these the most eminent orders of the celestial hierarchy all the rest, lest in the invisible world any of them might seem exempted, *δ.* "all things were created by Him and for Him," shewing Him as well the final as the efficient cause, not a mere instrumental cause which worketh by and for another. *ε.* "He is before all things, and by Him all things consist:" lest in any thing we should be thought not to depend immediately on the Son of God, He is described as the *Conserver* as well as *Creator*.—A most complete description of the Creator of the world, which if spoken of God the Father could not be in any way injurious to *His* Majesty.—Yet further: Undoubtedly there are but *two* kinds of *Creation* in the language of the Scriptures; the one *literal, old*, by way of *formation;* the other *metaphorical, new*, by way of *reformation*. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature;" 2 Cor. v. 17. "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but *a new creature;*" Gal. vi. 15....."but *faith which worketh by love;*" v. 6. "For we are the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, &c." Eph. ii. 10.....And he which is *so* created is called a *new man*, in opposition to "the *old man* which is corrupt, &c." whence we are

---

see *at length*,] shewing that it properly and fully expresses the truth of the creation of all things by the Son of God.

charged "to be renewed in the spirit of our mind, and to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness, &c." Eph. iv. 22., &c. and "renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him :" Col. iii. 10. The *new* creation then is described as consisting wholly in *renovation*, by which those who have lost the image of God in which Adam was created are restored to it by a *real*, though *not substantial* change wrought within them.....But the place under consideration, (Col. i. 15., &c.) *cannot* be interpreted of this *new* creation, therefore must be interpreted of the *first*. For the object of the creation *here* mentioned is of as universal latitude as the object of the *first* creation, not only expressed, but implied, by Moses. Whereas the object of the *new* creation is *not* of the same latitude. For the true notion of the *new* creation necessarily includes an *opposition* to a *former worse* condition, as the *new* man is always opposed to the *old*.....Since then.....there is no *new creature* but such whose *faith worketh by love*, and so *many* millions of *men* have *neither faith nor love*, it cannot be said that by Christ *all* things were created *anew*.....Again we cannot imagine the Apostle should speak of the creation in a *general* word, intending thereby *only* the *new*, and while so doing express *particularly* and *especially* those *parts* of the *old* creation which are *incapable* of the *new*, or have *no relation to it*..... Christ came not to redeem the *bad* angels, and the *good* angels were not so by virtue of His incarnation ; "He took not on Him the nature of angels." We acknowledge in *mankind* a *new* creation, because an *old* man becomes a *new ;* but

---

Shew that the *old, literal*, creation, not the *new* and *metaphorical* one (as has been pretended), is here meant. To

there is no such notion in the celestial hierarchy, because no *old* and *new angels:* they which fell are fallen for eternity; they which stand always stood, and shall stand for ever. Therefore except we could yet invent *another* creation, *neither* the *old nor* the *new*, we must conclude that all the angels were at first created by the Son of God, and so all things else, especially man, whose creation all the first Christian writers attribute to the Son, asserting that the words, "Let us make man," were spoken by the Father to Him.

159. The doctrine thus arising is clearly delivered by St John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made that was made;" John. i. 1, 2, 3. Here is sufficiently testified the truth both of Christ's existence at the beginning of the world, and of His creating it.....St John's words seem expressly designed to take off all objections first. He would teach those who knew the age of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, that this Christ made the world, which was created at least 4000 years before His birth. The name, *Jesus*, given at His circumcision, and the title *Christ*, belonging to His office, manifestly reach not to the creation of the world. St John therefore produces a name of His, as yet unknown to the world, or rather not noticed, though frequently used among the Jews, which belonged to Him who was made man, but before He was so. Under this he shews that He had a being in the beginning, when all things were *to be created*, consequently *were not* yet; then, *a.* "*In the beginning was the Word,*"

---

whom were addressed the words, "Let *us* make man?" Gen. i. 26. 159. St John i. 1, 2, 3. "In the beginning was

and so *not created*. β. Next, that the same Word at the same time "*was with God*," when He made all things, and therefore well may we conceive that *to Him* "God saith, Let *us* make man in *our* image, &c." and afterwards *of Him*, "The man is become as one of us." γ. Then, lest any should conceive the creation of the world too Divine a work for the Word, should object that none can create but God Himself, he adds, "*The Word was God.*" δ. Again, lest any should *divide* the Deity, or conceive *different* Gods, he repeats, "*the same was in the beginning with God;*" and then ε. delivers what at first might seem strange, but now may easily be accepted, "*All things were made by Him*, and without Him was not any thing made that was made." For now this is no new doctrine, but only an interpretation of those Scriptures which told us God made all things by His Word before. "God said, Let there be light; and there was light." And so, "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, &c." Psal. xxxiii. 6. whence "we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God;" Heb. xi. 3. 2 Pet. iii. 5. An interpretation familiar to the Jews, who by the Chaldee paraphrase were constantly taught that the word of God (בימרא דיי) was the same with God, and that by that Word all things were made. And therefore St John delivered so great a mystery so briefly, as speaking to those who at once understood him. Only what they yet knew not was, that this Word was made

---

the Word, &c." Give Pearson's exposition of this passage [which see *at length*], noting the steps by which the Apostle proceeds in setting forth the pre-existence and Divinity of the Son of God, and the creation of the world by Him. How, and wherefore, would the Jews be likely at once to understand what St John meant by the Word? State some futile attempts which have been made to evade the real force of this passage; and shew their absurdity.

flesh, and that this Word made flesh was Jesus Christ. This exposition then.....is infinitely to be preferred to any such as shall.....make of a sublime truth a weak, useless, false discourse. *α.* For who will grant that *in the beginning* must be the same with that in St John's *epistle*, "*from the beginning*;" 1 John i. 1.? ...an interpretation in itself contradictory; *the beginning* in St John's *epistle* being that in which the Apostles saw &c. the Word; *the beginning* in his *gospel* that in which *the Word was with God*; i. e. *not* seen, &c. by the Apostles, but known as yet to God alone, according to the *new* exposition. Why should the Apostle teach that the Word had a being in the beginning of the Gospel, when John the Baptist began to preach? [*Superfluous.*] —Again, who can imagine the Apostle should assert that *the Word was*, i. e. had an actual being? when as yet *not* actually the *Word*? For if *the beginning* be when John the Baptist began to preach, and *the Word* as *they* say, be nothing but he which speaketh, and so revealeth the will of God, Christ had *not then* revealed it, consequently was *not* then *actually*, only potentially, the Word. *β.* Secondly, To say, "*the Word was with God*, i. e. *was known to God*," is strangely figurative, especially in the Apostle's method. "In the beginning was the Word;" "*was*" must *here* signify *actual* existence; why then in the next sentence ".....was with God," should it signify an *objective* being only?.....But if we should imagine this to be understood of God's knowledge of the Word, why grant it to signify that He was known to God *alone*?.....a restriction moreover false, for He was known *also* to Gabriel, the angels who appeared to the shepherds, Zachariah, and Elizabeth, Simeon, Anna, Joseph and Mary. *γ.* To pass by the third attribute, *the Word was God* (presently to be handled), since the Apostle has repeated the circumstance of *time* as most material, "*the same was in the beginning with God*," and immediately subjoined, "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made that was made," how can we receive any exposition which refers not the making of all these things to Him in the beginning? But if we understand the *latter* part of the *Apostles*, who after His ascension did only what they were commanded and empowered by Him, it will bear no relation to the beginning; if we interpret the *former* of all which

---

Give a brief summary of the arguments by which it has been proved that Jesus Christ had a real being before He

Jesus said and did in the promulgation of the gospel, we yet reach not the *beginning* of the *new* expositors, for while John the Baptist preached, while in *their* sense the Word was God, they will not affirm that Jesus did any of these things; consequently, according to *their* grounds. "In the beginning was the Word, &c. insomuch as in the beginning *nothing* was done by Him, &c." [*Absurd.*] Wherefore...*in the beginning*, when the heavens and the earth were created, all things were made by the Word, who is Christ Jesus being made flesh, and consequently in the beginning Christ was. —[*Conclusion from* A. B. C.] Jesus Christ, because He was in heaven and descended thence before that which was born of the Virgin ascended thither, because He was before John the Baptist and before Abraham, because He was at the end of the first world and at the beginning of the same, therefore had a real being before He was conceived of the Virgin Mary. (Against the Photinians.*)

160. 2. That the being which Christ had *before* He was *conceived* by the *Virgin* was *not* any *created*, *but* the *Divine*, essence, by which *He* always was truly, really, and properly, *God.*

161. A. This necessarily follows from (what was just proved) the creating all things by Him. "He that built all things is God;" Heb. iii. 4. The Apostle, assuring us that "all things were made by Him," also tells us, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God:" "In the beginning" undeniably belonging to the *second* proposition, therefore undeniably to the *third* also. Therefore "in the beginning *the Word was God*," the *same God with whom* He was. For we cannot with any

---

was conceived of the Virgin Mary. After whom were the heretics named against whom Pearson vindicates this doctrine? 161. Shew that the being which Christ had before He was conceived of the Virgin was the Divine

*Named after Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, in the fourth century.

reason imagine either *α.* that He *was with one* God, and *was another*, because there can be but *one supreme* God, or *β.* that the Apostle should speak in the *second* proposition of a God *eternal* and *independent*, in the *third* of a *made* and *depending* God. Especially considering the eternal God was so constantly among the Jews called *the Word*, (St John's reason for using this phrase,) and also the manner of St John's writing, who makes the last word of the former sentence the first of that which follows: "In Him was *life*, and the *life*.....&c." John i. 4, 5. So, "In the beginning was *the Word*, and *the Word*," which so was in the beginning, "was with *God*, and the Word was *God*;" i. e. the *same* God with whom the Word was in the beginning. And this He could not be otherwise than by having the same *Divine essence.*

162. B. Whereas there can be no *equality* between the *Divine* essence and *any other*, Jesus Christ must be truly and essentially God, because *before His conception in the Virgin*, He *subsisted* in the *form of God*, and thought *Himself equal* with *God;* (in which thought He could not be deceived nor injurious to God.) For "being (rather *subsisting*) in the form of God, He thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But emptied Himself, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men;" Phil. ii. 6, 7. From which words result three propositions, fully proving our assertion.

163. (*a*) Christ was in the form of a servant, *as*

---

essence, from the ascription to Him of the creating of all things; and prove, from John i. 1. &c. (in opposition to certain cavils,) that He was the *same God with whom* He was. 162-165. "Being in the form of God, &c." Phil. ii. 6, 7. [See passage *at length.*] What are the three principal propositions hence resulting? 163. Shew

soon as He *was made man.* It is a vain imagination that He *first* appeared a servant when apprehended, &c. and crucified. For they who suffered such things were not all slaves, or if slaves, their death did not make but find them so. Besides, our Saviour *never* lived as a *servant* to any earthly *master.* He was indeed at first *subject*, but as a *son*, to Joseph and His mother. When he appeared in public, He lived as a Prophet sent from God, *Master* of His Apostles, subject to no man in His office, and obedient only to God. The form then of a servant which He took upon Him must consist is something distinct from His sufferings, or submission to men : as the *condition in which He was* when He so submitted and suffered. In that He was "made flesh," sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh," subject to the infirmities and miseries of the fallen sons of Adam—in that He was "made of a woman, made under the Law," Gal. iv. 4.; and so obliged to perform the same, which Law treated the children of God as servants—in that He was born, bred, and lived, in a mean, low, and abject condition, "as a root out of a dry ground, &c." Isai. liii 2, 3.—In that He was *thus made man*, He took upon Him the form of a servant. This is the Apostle's explication, added not by way of *conjunction*, but of *apposition*, In our translation we (improperly) read, "He made Himself of no reputation, and took &c., and was made &c." three *distinct* propositions ; whereas *all the words together* are but an expression of Christ's exinanition, with an explanation shewing in what it consists ; *literally* [see original], "But

---

that Christ was in the form of a *servant as soon as* He was *made man.* Could He be properly considered a *servant* in respect of any earthly *master?* In what did His taking on Him the form of a servant properly consist? Give, and explain the effect of, Pearson's correction of our translation

emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men:" *i. e.* emptied Himself, by "taking the form of a servant;" took the form of a servant by "being made in the likeness of men." Indeed, after expressing this exinanition, St Paul with a conjunction adds another act of Christ's humiliation; "And being found in fashion as a man," being already by His exinanition in the form of a servant, or the likeness of men, "He humbled Himself, and became (rather *becoming*) obedient unto death, &c." As therefore His *humiliation* consisted in His *obedience unto death*, so His *exinanition* consisted in the *assumption* of the form of a *servant*, and *that* in the nature of man. Fitly expressed by a strange interpretation, Heb. x. 5. of the words, "*.....mine ears hast Thou opened;*" Ps. xl. 6. which, expressing the *boring of the ear* —under the Law a mark of perpetual servitude,—the Apostle appropriates thus to Christ. "when He cometh into the world, He saith,.....*a body hast Thou prepared me:*" whence it follows that when Christ's body was first framed, even *then* He assumed the form of a servant.

164. (*b*) Christ *was in the form of God before* He was in the form of a *servant*, consequently *before* He was *made man*.....For He is *first* expressly said to be in the form of *God*, and *being* so to think it no robbery to be *equal* with *God*, and *notwithstanding* that *equality* to take upon Him the form of a servant; therefore undeniably He was *before* that assumption *in the form of God*. Besides, He was not in the form of a servant but by emptying Himself, and all *exinanition* neces-

---

of Phil. ii. 7. In what consisted Christ's humiliation? [see ver. 8.] in what His exinanition? "Mine ears hast thou opened;" Psal. xl. 6. To what is this equivalent according to the Apostle's interpretation in the Epistle to the Hebrews? and what follows from that interpretation? 164. Shew also that Christ was *in the form of*

sarily *presupposes* a precedent *plenitude*; but the plenitude which Christ had, in respect whereof assuming the form of a Servant He is said to empty Himself, could be in nothing else but in *the form of God* in which He was *before*.

165. (*c*) Christ was as much *in the form of God* as in the form of a *servant*, and did as *really subsist* in the *Divine* nature as in the nature of *man*. For He was *so in the form of God* as thereby to be *equal with God*. But no other form beside the *essential*, which is the Divine nature itself, could infer such equality. "To whom will ye liken Me, and make Me equal?" Isai. xl. 25. xlvi. 5. There can be but One infinite, eternal, independent Being; and there can be no comparison between that and whatsoever is finite, &c. He therefore who did truly think Himself equal with God as being in the form of God, must subsist in the One infinite, &c. nature of God. Again, the phrase "in the form of God," not elsewhere mentioned, is used by the Apostle with a respect to that other, "in the form of a servant," exegetically continued "in the likeness of man:"—the *form of God* must be as *real* as the *form of a servant*, or there would be no force in the Apostle's words, no fitness in his argument to prove any great humiliation in Christ's exinanition. But by the *form* is certainly understood the *true condition* of a *servant*, by the *likeness the real nature* of *man*, *nor* does the *fashion* in which He was found *destroy*, *but* rather *assert* the *truth* of His *humanity*. Therefore as surely as Christ

---

God before He was in the form of a *servant*, consequently *before* He was *made man*. 165. Shew also that Christ was as much *in the form of God* as in that of a *servant*, and did as *really subsist* in the *nature* of *God* as in that of *man*. State the conclusion to be drawn from pars. 163, 164, 165.

was *really man*, of the same nature with us, in whose similitude He was made, so surely was He also *really God*, of the same nature and being with Him in whose form he did subsist. [Conclusion from (*a*) (*b*) (*c*).] Christ had a real existence before He was begotten of the Virgin, and the *being which He had* was the *Divine essence*, by which *He* was truly, really, and properly, *God*.

166. C. Jesus Christ, as He *is* after, so *was* before any time assignable, truly and essentially God: inasmuch as He is expressly styled Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, without restriction or limitation; by which title God describes and distinguishes His own being. "I am the first, and I am the last; and beside Me there is no God;" Isai. xliv. 6. see also xli. 4. and xlviii. 12. Now Christ proclaims Himself "Alpha and Omega, the first and the last;" Rev. i. 11. So also in..."I am the first and the last," Rev. i. 17. "these things saith the first and the last," Rev. ii. 8. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last," Rev. xxii. 13. this title is attributed absolutely, &c. to Christ in the same latitude and eminence as it is, or can be, to the supreme God. From another Scripture, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty;" Rev. i. 8. whether "*the Lord*" who so calls Himself be understood of the Father or the Son, the conclusion equally follows. For if understood of *Christ*,

---

166. Shew that the being which Christ had before He was conceived by the Virgin was the Divine essence, from His being styled Alpha and Omega. Quote the texts where He is so styled. "I am Alpha and Omega, &c." Rev. i. 8. admits of being referred to the Father or the Son; shew that the conclusion affirmative of Christ's Divinity equally follows according to either interpretation.

as the context implies, then *He* is that "Lord, which is, &c." *i. e.* the supreme eternal God, of the same Divine essence with the Father, who is described in the same terms: see Rev. i. 4. and iv. 8.—if of the *Father*, then did He *so* describe Himself that He might be known to be the One Almighty Eternal God; and consequently *whosoever* should assume that title must attribute *as much* to Himself; wherefore *Christ*, since He hath immediately with such solemnity and frequency taken the *same style* upon *Him*, has declared *Himself* the supreme Almighty and Eternal God.

167. D. Jesus Christ before He was begotten of the Virgin was actually and essentially God: inasmuch as He is expressly called "The Lord, Holy, holy, holy, the Lord of Hosts, whose glory filleth the whole earth;" Isai. vi. 1, 3. which title can belong to none but the One and only God. That Christ was He, thus called, whose glory Isaiah saw "in the year that king Uzziah died," St John testifies, "These things said Esias, when he saw *His*"—i. e. *Christ's*—"glory and spake of *Him*;"—i. e. *Christ*, for of Him only is the Apostle speaking in that place; John xii. 41. for having declared that the Jews believed not in Jesus though He had done so many miracles before them, ver. 37. he adds, "that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled,.....Lord, who hath believed our report;" ver. 38. And, "they could not believe" in Him, "because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, &c." The Jews then refusing to believe in our

---

167. Prove the eternal Divinity of Christ from Isaiah's description of Him whose glory he saw; Isai. vi. in connexion with St John's testimony that that glory was the glory of Christ; John xii. 41.; quoting the requisite texts, &c.

Saviour were those of whom the prophet spake: for "these things said Esaias when he saw His glory, and spake of Him." ver. 41.....Wherefore, since St John hath infallibly taught us that the prophet saw the glory of *Christ*, and the prophet that He whose glory he saw was the *One* Omnipotent and eternal *God*, *Christ* did *then* subsist in that glorious Majesty of the *eternal Godhead.*

168. E. Jesus Christ before He was conceived by the Virgin Mary, was always truly, really, and properly God; inasmuch as He, being *man*, is frequently in the Scriptures called *God*, in such a manner as by that name no other can be understood but the One only and eternal God.

169. (1) There can be but *one Divine essence*, and so but *one Supreme God.* If then it were not said in Scripture that there are *many Gods*.....to have alleged *Christ* to be *God*, had been enough to prove *His supreme* and *eternal Deity.* Whereas *now* we are answered that there being "Gods many," it follows not from that name that He is the *one eternal God.* But if Christ be *none* of those *many Gods*, and *yet God*, He can be no other but that *One.* Now He is *none* of *them*, because clearly distinguished from, and opposed to, them.—i. "I have said, ye are gods, &c." Psal. lxxxii. 6. But *these* gods "knew not, neither would they understand, &c." ver. 5. and whosoever were gods only as *they* were, did, or might do so. Whereas Christ, "In Whom alone dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" Col. ii. 9. is...*opposed* to *such* gods, by His disciples, saying, "Now we are sure that Thou knowest all things;" John xvi. 30.

---

168. What is to be concluded from Christ, though man, being frequently in Scripture called God in a manner applicable only to the One eternal? 169. Shew from Scripture that Jesus Christ, being called God, is not one of

by Himself, proclaiming, "I am the light of the world, &c." viii. 12.—ii. St Paul hath told us "there be gods many, and lords many;" but hath also taught us that "to us there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ;" 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. Where, as the Father is as much opposed to the "many lords" as "many gods," so is the Son as much to the "many gods" as "many lords;" the Father being as much Lord as God, the Son as much God as Lord.—Since then whosoever is called God must either be the one supreme God, or one of the "many gods" intimated in Scripture, and since our Saviour is *none* of *them*, and *yet* is often styled *God*, the name must be attributed to Him in a manner applicable only to the One Almighty and Eternal God.

170. (2) Again, those who deny our Saviour to be the same God with the Father, have invented these rules, that (*a*) the name of God where taken *absolutely*, as the *subject* of any proposition, always signifies the supreme Majesty, *excluding all others* from that Deity:—(*b*) where used with an *article* by way of excellency, likewise signifies the same supreme Godhead as *admitting others* to a *communion* of *Deity*, but *excluding* them from the *supremacy*:—on which two rules they found this observation, that the *name of God* (*a*) taken *absolutely* and placed as the *subject* of any proposition is *not* to be understood of *Christ*;—(*b*) wheresoever spoken of our Saviour by way of *predicate*, never has an article denoting excellency, consequently leaves *Him* in the number of *those* gods who are *excluded* from the *Eternal Deity*.

---

the "gods many" who in a certain sense are so called, and that He is therefore the One supreme God. 170. Pearson states two rules invented in opposition to the truth of our Saviour's being the same God with the Father. What are they? and what observations have their framers founded upon them?

171. Now though there be no kind of certainty in such observation of the *articles*, because the Greeks promiscuously often use or omit them, *...—though if those rules were granted, their conclusion would not follow, for the supreme God is often named (as they confess) without an article, and therefore the omission does not prove the distinction they contend for—yet to complete our demonstration it shall be shewn ;

172. (*a*) That the *name* of *God* taken *subjectively is* to be understood of *Christ*. i. "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness : God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory ;" 1 Tim. iii. 16. This *God*, the *subject* of all these last six propositions, must be understood of *Christ*, because of Him each one is true, of none but Him all are so. *α.* He was the Word which was God, and was made flesh ; consequently "*God manifested in the flesh.*" *β.* On Him the Spirit descended at His baptism, and after His ascension was poured on His Apostles, ratifying His commission, and confirming the doctrine they received of Him ; wherefore He was "*God justified in the Spirit.*" *γ.* The angels celebrated His nativity, ministered to Him, were present at His resurrection and Ascension ;.....wherefore He was "*God seen of*

---

171. Does Greek usage with respect to the insertion or omission of the articles afford any certain ground for the rules which the deniers of our Saviour's divinity have framed from such insertion or omission in reference to the name of God ? Why, even if their rules were granted, would their conclusion still be without certainty ? 172. ".....God was manifested in the flesh, &c." 1 Tim. iii. 16. Give Pearson's explication of the passage [*at length*],

* The reader is aware that the use of the Greek Article is a matter of much critical study. See, especially, Bp. Middleton's work on the subject. *G.*

angels." δ. The Apostles preached Jesus Christ unto all nations. See Acts viii. 5. ix. 20. xi. 20. xvii. 3, &c. &c. The Father "separated Paul... and called him.....to reveal His Son unto him, that he might preach Him among the heathen;" Gal. i. 15, 16. wherefore He was "*God preached unto the Gentiles.*" ε. John the Baptist spake "unto the people that they should believe on.... Christ Jesus;" Acts xix. 4. "We have believed in Jesus Christ," saith St Paul; Gal. ii. 16. "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ;" Acts xvi. 31. wherefore He was "*God believed on in the world.*" ζ. Forty days after His resurrection, He was visibly taken up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father; wherefore He was "*God received up into glory.*" Thus are all these propositions plainly true of Christ;.....but all these cannot be understood of any other which is, or is called, God. α. *Not* of any of the Divine *attributes;* for these are never in Scripture called God, nor can any of them be the subject of these propositions: when they tell us that "God," *i. e.* the *will of God*, was "manifested in the flesh," *i. e. revealed by frail and mortal men*, and "received up into glory," *i. e. received gloriously on earth*, they teach us a language which the Scriptures know not, &c. β. *Nor* of any Divine *Person but the Son:* not of the Holy Ghost, for He is distinguished from *Him* as being "justified by the Spirit;" not of the Father, who was not "manifested in the flesh," nor "received up into glory." Therefore the name of God taken *absolutely* and *subjectively* must here be understood

---

shewing from it that Christ is the One supreme God. Shew that no Divine attribute, and no Divine Person except the Son, can be the subject of the proposition in this passage. "Take heed.....to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of

of *Christ*.—ii. "Take heed unto yourselves," saith St Paul to the Ephesian elders, "and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood;" Acts xx. 28. Words clearly containing this doctrinal proposition, *God* hath purchased the Church with His own blood. For no other word in or near the text can by any grammatical construction be joined with the verb, except the *Holy Ghost;* but *He* hath neither purchased the Church, nor hath blood to shed for our redemption: *God* therefore is certainly the subject of this proposition; and this God may and must be understood of *Christ*,—*may*, for He hath—*must*, for *no other* person called *God* hath—so purchased the Church. "We were... redeemed.....with the precious blood of Christ," 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.; but no other person called God can be said so to have purchased us, because it is an act belonging properly to the office of the "*One Mediator* between God and men." 1 Tim. ii. 5. See also Heb. x. 10. *Nor* can *blood* signifying *death*, be attributed to the *Father*, who though omnipotent cannot die. And though He might be said to purchase us, because He gave His Son a ransom for us, yet it cannot be said that He did it by *His own blood*—a phrase, moreover, in Scripture put by way of opposition to the blood of *another*. "Not by the blood of goats, &c. but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place;" Heb. ix. 12. and whereas "the High Priest entered every year with the blood of others, Christ appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself;"

God which He hath purchased with His own blood;" Acts xx. 28. Shew from this passage, quoting other requisite texts, that Christ is the One supreme God. In

ver. 25, 26.....He, not the Father, is thus opposed to the Aaronical High Priest.....Wherefore, wheresoever the Father and the Son are described together as working the salvation of man, the *blood* by which it is wrought is attributed to the *Son*, *not* the *Father*: as when St Paul speaks of "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His"—*i. e.* His own, the *Son's*—"*blood*, to declare His" *i. e.* His own, the *Father's*—"righteousness;" Rom. iii. 25. See also Eph. i. 6, 7.; where "the Beloved, in whom we have redemption through His blood" is spoken of the *Son*, not the *Father*, who is there glorified as having blessed, elected, &c. us. Certain general acts, as *blessing* us, *making known* to us the *will of God*, *delivering* us, are attributed both to the Father and the Son, but a difference is to be observed as to the manner, &c. of performing them; the *Son* doing them Himself, the *Father* through the Son. The Son "gave *Himself* for our sins, that He might deliver us." Gal. i. 4.—the Father gave *His Son*—therefore the Apostle gives thanks to the Father "who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son, in whom we have redemption through His blood;" Col. i. 13, 14.—the blood of the new covenant, therefore of the Mediator, and, moreover, since the covenant is also a testament, the blood of the Testator; "for where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testator;" Heb. ix. 16. But the Testator who died *cannot* be the *Father*, *but* the *Son*; consequently the blood is

---

disproof of what particular assertion of the deniers of Christ's divinity have the two leading passages in this paragraph been made use of?

the blood of the *Son*, not of the *Father*. The God then who purchased the Church with His own blood is.....none other than *Jesus Christ* the *Son of God*, and God. Wherefore the name of *God* taken *absolutely* and *subjectively* is sometimes to be understood of *Christ*.

173. (*b*[1]) That the name of *God* with an *article* of *excellency* is attributed to *Christ*. i. He is *so* named God when called *Emmanuel*, (in fulfilment of Isai. vii. 14.) which "being interpreted," saith St Matthew, "is *God with us*," i. 23.; (Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς.) It is vain to imagine that Christ is *called* Emmanuel, but *is not* what He is called, as in the case of the altars built by Moses and Gideon, which were respectively called *Jehovah Nissi*, Exod. xvii. 15. and *Jehovah Shalom*, Judg. vi. 24. and of Jerusalem called *The Lord our righteousness*, Jer. xxxiii. 16.: because the two notions conjoined in the name *Emmanuel* are severally *true* of *Christ*, who is α. *Emmanu*, "with us," for He hath "dwelt among us," John i. 14. and when departing from the earth said to His disciples,... "I am with you alway, &c." Matt. xxviii. 20.— and β. *El*. "God," "For unto us a child is born, &c. and His name shall be called.....the mighty God;" Isai. ix. 6. (אל גבור). Indeed if the name *Emmanuel* were to be interpreted as a *proposition*, "*God is with us*," as "The Lord our righteousness," and "the Lord is there," Ezek. xlviii. 35. must be understood were names of Jerusalem, it should have been the name not of *Christ*, but of *His Church*.....Christ therefore must be acknowledged *God with us* with an expression of that excellency which belongs to

---

173. Shew—in disproof of what assertion of the deniers of Christ's divinity?—that the name of God with an article of excellency is attributed to Christ. Make any requisite

the supreme Deity.—ii. Thomas said unto *Christ*, "My Lord and my God," John xx. 28. rather, "The Lord of me and the God of me," (Ὁ Κύριός μου, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς μου,) whence *Christ* is evidently that God before whose name the Greek article is prefixed by way of excellency.....iii. Christ is not only styled with their required article of excellency "the God," but for a further certainty, "the true God," by the same Apostle who said the Word was God. "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." (Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινός Θεός, κ. τ. λ.) 1 John v. 20. Compare "the word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; He (οὗτός) is Lord of all;" Acts x. 36. where it is acknowledged that the "Lord of all" is by the pronoun "He" joined to *Jesus Christ*, the *immediate*, *not* to *God*, the *remote*, antecedent; so here "the true God" is to be referred to *Christ*.....next to it, *not* to the *Father*.....at a distance. The only reason alleged against this mode of reference is that taken *grammatically* these words *may* be ascribed to the *Father*; as when "another king arose which knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred;" Acts vii. 18, 19. "the same" refers us *not* to *Joseph* but to the *king* of *Egypt*. Whereas if nothing can be objected but a *grammatical possibility* we may as well say that *Joseph* dealt subtilly with his kindred as the *king of Egypt*; grammatically correct, though historically absurd.—Wherefore since Jesus Christ is the immediate antecedent to which the relative may properly be referred, since the Son of God is He of whom the Apostle chiefly speaketh,—since this is rendered as a reason why "we are in Him

observations on the three leading passages quoted by Pearson in this paragraph, and quote requisite texts.

that is true," by being "in His Son," namely because that Son "is the true God,"—since St John constantly calls our Saviour "eternal life," since from the text all these reasons may be drawn why the title of the true God should be attributed to the *Son*, none why it should be referred to the *Father*,—I conclude that *our Saviour is* the *true God*, so styled in Scripture with a prefixed article of eminency, as the Christian writers immediately following the Apostles both spoke and wrote.

174. (*b*) That were there *no* such particular place where the article were expressed, yet we find such *adjuncts* fixed to the *name* of *God* when attributed to *Christ* as are *equivalent* to an *article* or whatsoever may express the *supreme* Majesty. As when St Paul magnifies the Jews, "of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen;" Rom. ix. 5. where Christ is *α.* called *God;* even He who came of the Jews, though not *as* He so came, *i. e.* according to the flesh, here distinguished from His Godhead. *β.* called God, *not* as one of the *many* gods, but as the *one supreme* God, God over all, *γ.* with the addition of *blessed*, which of itself elsewhere signifies the supreme God, (see Mark xiv. 61. 2. Cor. xi. 31.) and was always used by the Jews to express that *one God* of *Israel.* Wherefore St Paul would not write to converted Jews and proselytes (which most of the then Christians were) unless he meant that they should believe Christ the same God whom they always in that manner adored. Compare also the manner in

---

174. "Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever: Amen;" Rom. ix. 5. Prove from this passage the supreme Deity of Christ; shewing the force of the term "blessed," and how converted *Jews* would understand it; quoting requisite texts &c.

which he speaks of "the God and *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is *blessed* for evermore," 2 Cor. xi. 31. and of the *supreme God* the Creator "who is blessed for ever, Amen." Rom. i. 25. whence is manifest the equality or rather identity of *Christ's* Deity, of whom he also speaks as "over all, God *blessed* for ever, Amen."……If we consider the Apostle's scope, which is to magnify the Israelites by an enumeration of their peculiar privileges (the most eminent being the genealogy of our Saviour) we shall find that their glory did *not* consist in this, that Christ at *first* was born of them *a man*, and *afterwards made a God*, (for what great honour could thus accrue to them ?)... but that the Most High God, blessed for ever, should "take on Him the seed of Abraham," and come of the Jews "as concerning the flesh."—Thus every way it appears that the Apostle spake of *Christ* as the *one eternal* God.

175. *General conclusion.* Since Jesus Christ A. was in the beginning with God, and was God,—B. was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with Him before He was in the nature of man.—C. is styled Alpha and Omega, without limitation,—D. was He whose glory Isaiah saw as the glory of the God of Israel,—E. is, although man, frequently called God in all the ways proper to the supreme God,—therefore He had a being before He was conceived by the Virgin Mary, and that being was *not* any *created* but the *Divine* essence, nor was He any *creature*, but the *true eternal God.* (In opposition to the Arians.)*

---

175. Give a brief summary of the arguments by which it has been proved that the being which Christ had before He was conceived by the Virgin was the divine essence, whereby He was the true eternal God. Against whom (from whom named ?) is this doctrine vindicated ?

* Named from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria in the fourth century. Pearson mentions also (in note) another Arius, a deacon, who at the same time fell into the same heresy as the presbyter Arius.

176. 3. That the Divine essence which Christ had in the beginning as the Word, He had *not* of *Himself*, but by *communication* from God the *Father*.—(*a*) Undeniably there can be but One essence properly Divine, therefore but one infinite God; there can be but *One Person originally of Himself subsisting* in that infinite being, or there were a multiplicity of Gods; [*see par.* 53. (*a*)] and the father of Jesus Christ is *that* One Person. Wherefore Jesus Christ, *not so* subsisting, *yet* truly the *eternal God*, must have the Godhead communicated to Him from the *Father*. [*see par.* 51.]—"All things whatsoever the Father hath are Mine," John xvi. 15. saith Christ, because in Him is the same fulness of Godhead,.....yet in that perfect equality is this disparity, that the Father hath His Godhead from none, the Son from the Father.—"As the Father hath life in Himself, so, &c." John v. 26. "The Son can do nothing of Himself but, &c." v. 19. "The Father is greater than I;" xiv. 28. [*See par.* 48. *throughout*, where these three texts are quoted, &c.]—"I know Him," saith Christ, "for I am from Him;" John vii. 29. And because He is from the Father, He is by the Nicene Council called "God of God, Light of Light, &c." The Father is God, *not of God*; &c. Christ is God, *but of God*: &c.—(*b*) Moreover, the Divine nature, absolutely immaterial, being also *indivisible*, Christ *cannot* have any *part* of it communicated to Him, *but* the *whole*: by which He must be

---

176. Shew that the divine essence which Christ had, He had by communication from the Father. [176. (*a*) is given the more briefly because in great part anticipated in the paragraphs above referred to; which see.] Shew that Christ must have the *whole* of the divine essence communicated to Him. By what term did the Nicene Council denote the *consubstantiality* of Christ with the Father? Give Pearson's explication of "I and the Father

acknowledged *co-essential*, (ὁμοούσιος) *of the same substance* with the Father, as the council of Nice, after the ancient fathers, determined. Hence appears the truth of our Saviour's words, "I and the Father are One;" John x. 30. where the plurality of the verb and the neutrality of the noun, with the distinction of their persons, speak a perfect identity of their essence. And though Christ says, "The Father is in Me, and I in Him;" ver. 38. yet He also saith, "I came out from the Father;" xvi. 27. by the former shewing the Divinity of His essence, by the latter the origination of Himself. We must not look on the Divine nature as sterile, but admire the fecundity and communicability of itself, on which the creation of the world depends; God making all things by His Word, to whom He first communicated that omnipotency which is the cause of all things.

177. 4. That the communication of the Divine essence by the Father is the generation of the Son; and Christ, eternally God, not from Himself but from the Father, is the eternal Son of God.—(*a*) God always had a Son: "Who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is His name? and what is His Son's name?" Prov. xxx. 4. Mahomet denied this truth; because otherwise he could not possibly prefer himself to our Saviour; whereas he *might* persuade his disciples that he was greater than any merely human prophet. Wherefore he frequently inculcates in his Alcoran that God hath no such Son, nor any equal with Him; and his disciples corruptly read, "Thou

---

are One;" John x. 20. and of "The Father is in Me, &c." ver. 38. compared with "I came out from the Father;" xvi. 27. How does Pearson connect the *creation of the world* with the *communicability* of the *Divine nature*? 177. (*a*) Shew that God *always* had a *Son*. Why did Mahomet deny that God ever had a Son? "Thou art My Son; &c." Psal. ii. 7. How do the followers of Mahomet

art my *prophet*, I have *educated* thee," instead of "Thou art My *Son*, this day have I *begotten* Thee;" Psal. ii. 7. The *later* Jews reading the words correctly, yet apply them *exclusively* to *David*, to avoid the Christians' confession. But by the consent of the *ancient* Jews, and the interpretation of the Apostles, we know these words belong to *Christ*, and in the *most proper* sense to Him *alone*. "Unto which of the *angels* said He at any time, Thou art My Son, &c." Heb. i. 5: a nugatory argument if He had said thus to any other *man as* to Him.—(*b*) That the communication of the Divine essence by the Father was the true and proper generation by which He hath begotten the Son, appears thus: because the most proper generation we know is nothing but a vital production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced. Thus man begetteth a son, *i. e.* produces another man of the same nature with himself; (see Gen. i. 28. v. 3.) whence the relation of Paternity and Filiation..... A son is nothing but another produced by his father in the same nature with him. But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same Divine essence by which He [the Father] is God; and consequently He [the Son] is of the same nature with Him, and therefore the perfect image and similitude of Him, and therefore His *proper* Son. In human generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude;—one as to internal nature, *essential;* a *man's son must* be

---

corrupt this passage? How is it applied by the later Jews? Shew the correctness of the (what?) view of it taken by the *ancient* Jews, from the interpretation of it by St Paul, Heb. i. 5.—(*b*) What is the true notion of *generation*? Distinguish between two kinds of similitude in human generations. What is the *essential* similitude founded on

a *man*;—the other as to external form, &c. *accidental*; the child *may* thus represent *one* or *other* parent, or *neither*. The communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word is evidently a sufficient foundation for the *essential similitude* of identity of nature; whence Christ is called "the image of God, the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person;" 2 Cor. iv. 4. Heb. i. 3.—(*c*) Moreover, this communication of the Divine essence is a far more proper generation than any natural generation of the creature, not only because in a more perfect manner, but also because of most perfect identity of nature. As in the Divine essence we acknowledge all the perfections, without any of the accompanying imperfections, of the creature, so in the communication we must look on the reality without any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In *human generation* α. the son is begotten by derivation, or *decision* of *part* of the substance of the parent;.....an imperfection, because it supposes a substance *divisible*, consequently corporeal; whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, *indivisible*; and therefore His nature is really communicated not by derivation, &c. but by a *total* and *plenary* communication:—β. the father necessarily precedes the son, for since generation is for the perpetuity of the species, where the individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if a parent can produce another to survive him and continue the existence of his nature: but this imperfection of mortality belongs

---

the communication of the Divine essence? (*c*) How is this communication a far *more proper* generation than any generation of the creature? State the *particulars* in which *human* generation is *inferior* in *propriety* to the generation consisting in the communication of the Divine essence. Animals on arriving at perfection become

not to the eternal God; the essence which He always had without beginning, without beginning He did communicate, always father as always God: animals, when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolific; in God eternal perfection shews eternal fecundity:—γ. the son, though of the *same nature* with the father, is *not* the *same man*, because, though he has an *essence* of the *same kind*, he has *not* the *same essence:* the power of generation depending on the benediction, "Increase and *multiply.*" But the *Divine* essence is by its simplicity *incapable* of *division*, by its infinity of *multiplication;*..... insomuch that He which proceedeth by the communication of it hath not only the same nature, but is also the same God: The Father God and the Word God, *both* the *same God;* whereas Abraham man, and Isaac man, but *Abraham one man, Isaac another man.*—*Conclusion.* The eternal communication of the Divine nature is the proper generation by which Christ is, and is called, the true and proper Son of God. Hence St Peter's confession, "Thou art the Son of the living God;" Matt. xvi. 16.—hence our Saviour's distinction, "I go unto My Father and to your Father;" John xx. 17. [*see par.* 44. *near beg.*]—hence the verity, *more* than a *negation* of *falsity*, raised by St John, "we are in the true Son;" 1 John v. 20. for *we*, though being in Him *true*, *not false* sons, are not *such* as "*the true Son;*"—hence St Paul's argument of God's infinite love towards man, in that He "spared not His own" *proper* "Son;" Rom. viii. 32.

---

prolific; what argument may hence be drawn illustrative of the eternal fecundity of God?—What is the conclusion established in par. 177.? Quote texts founded on that conclusion. What is the *full* force of "We are in *the true Son?*" 1 John v. 20.

178. 5. That the Divine essence was so *peculiarly* communicated to the *Word* that there was *never* any *other naturally begotten* by the *Father;* in which respect *Christ* is the *Only-begotten* Son of God. For the clearing of which truth we must

179. (*a*) Enquire into the true notion of the *Only-begotten.* Here i. we must avoid the vain interpretation of the ancient heretics, who would refer "*only*" *not* to the *Son* but to the *Father*, as if the *Only-begotten* were no more than *begotten* of the *Father only:* contrary to the language of Scripture, and the custom of men, who use it..... for him who alone is begotten of any.—ii. must avoid also that of the latter heretics, who take *only-begotten* to be merely the *most beloved* of all the sons, because Isaac was called the only son of Abraham, who had also Ishmael, and Solomon the "only-begotten before his mother," when David had other children even by the mother of Solomon. For the *only-begotten* and the *most beloved differ* as *cause* and *effect;* Though the *only* son be the *beloved* son, it is in *this* order, "*beloved*" *because* "*only.*" Though therefore Christ be the *only-begotten and* the *beloved* Son of God, we must not regard these two attributes as equivalent in meaning, but as one depending on the other, the singular love on the unigeniture. Besides, Isaac was called the *only* son of Abraham.....because he was the *only* son of the *free woman*, of the *promise* made to Abraham, "Sarah shall have a son," "In Isaac shall thy seed be called;" Gen. xviii. 14.

---

179. What is the proper and full signification of *Only begotten*, as applied to Christ? Pearson mentions two expositions given by heretics of this term. What are they? and how shewn to be far short of the truth? Quote requisite texts. Christ is the Father's "beloved" Son; is also the "only-begotten" Son: how should we understand those statements as they may concern ourselves?

xxi. 12. So.....the Apostle, ".....he that had *received the promises* offered up his *only-begotten* son;" Heb. xi. 17.—iii. We must therefore, regarding these two expositions as far short of the truth, look on the *only-begotten* in the most proper, full, and significant sense, as signifying a Son *so* begotten as none other is, was, or can be: so as *only* shall refer not only to the Father generating, but also to the Son begotten,* and to the manner of the generation.—The Father indeed said, "Thou art My *beloved* Son, &c," and thereby we are to understand that whosoever of us are beloved of the Father are so in and through the Son. In the same manner Christ is the *only-begotten* Son of God; and whosoever of us are the sons of God are brought into that near relation by fellowship with Him who is by a far nearer relation the *natural* and *eternal* Son.

180. (*b*) Shew that the Divine essence was *peculiarly* communicated to the *Word*, by which *He* was *begotten* the *Son* of God, and never any was *so* begotten beside *that Son*. Two difficulties are here to be met.—i. There were *other* sons of God said to be *begotten* of Him, to whom either the Divine essence was communicated, and then such communication to the Word made not Him the *only-begotten;* or was not communicated, and then such communication is not necessary for such a filiation.—*Answer.* We acknowledge that others are frequently called the sons of God, and that we call the same God our Father as Christ called His; ".....He is not ashamed to call us brethren; Heb. ii. 11. and that those whom St Paul "hath begotten through the gospel" may well be termed

---

180. Shew i. that any others than Christ who are said to be sons of God and to be begotten of Him, are not

* μόνος ἐκ μόνου.—*S. Cyril.*

the "begotten of God, whose seed remaineth in them :"—but withal we affirm that *our regeneration* is of a nature wholly *different* from the *generation* of the *Son*. We are first generated, and have our natural being ; after that *regenerated*, and so receive a spiritual renovation, and through that an inheritance incorruptible ; the *generation* of Christ admits *no regeneration*, He becoming at once thereby God, and Son, and Heir of all. The Sonship we come into, being but of *adoption*, shews *our generation* but *metaphorical ;* Christ is so truly begotten, so properly the *natural* Son of God, that *His generation excludes* the name of *adoption*, and even in His *humanity refuses* the name of an *adopted* son....." God sent forth His Son made of a woman, &c. to redeem them that were under the Law, that we (not He) might receive the adoption of sons ;" Gal. iv. 4, 5. He then whose generation totally differs from ours, who in Scripture is named *the true Son*, by the Father sometimes *His own*, sometimes His *beloved*, but never His *adopted* son, who is thus plainly distinguished from us who can claim no higher than *adopted filiation*, is truly by His *natural* and *peculiar generation* the *only-begotten* Son of God, because the Divine *essence* was communicated to Him in His *natural* and *eternal generation*, whereas only the *grace* of God is conveyed to us in our *adoption*.—ii. The same Divine essence which is communicated to the Son is as truly and really communicated to the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word by that communication become the *Son*, and not the Holy Ghost [become so] by the same ? or if by receiving the same nature He also be the Son of God, how is the

---

begotten in the same sense as Christ is :—and ii. the distinction between the Word and the Holy Ghost as

Word the *only Son?—Answer.* The Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word; but though the communicated essence be the same, there is a difference in the communication, the Word being God by *generation*, the Holy Ghost by *procession:* and though *every thing* which is *begotten*, *proceedeth*, yet *every thing* which *proceedeth* is *not begotten.* Wherefore in the language of Scripture and the Church the Holy Ghost is never said to be *begotten*, but to *proceed* from the Father, is never called the *Son*, but the *Gift*, of God. *Eve*, produced out of Adam, and in the same nature, yet was *not born* of him, nor truly his *daughter;* whereas *Seth*, proceeding from the same person, in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly his *son:* This difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production; *Eve* descending *not* from Adam, as *Seth did*, by way of *generation*, i. e. by natural fecundity. The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with Him; the Word proceedeth from the same Person in the same similitude of nature, but the *Word* proceeding is the *Son*, the Holy Ghost is *not*, because the first procession is by way of generation, the other not. The *procession* of the *Holy Ghost* therefore *no way prejudices* the eternal *generation* as pertaining solely to the *Son* of God.

181. *General conclusion from* 1—5. Since Jesus Christ had a real being before He was conceived of the Virgin Mary, since that being was the Divine essence, since He had that Divinity not

---

regards *Sonship.* What analogy may be alleged in illustration of this distinction? 181. Give a brief summary of the arguments from which it is concluded that Christ is the *Only-begotten* Son of God.

of Himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from Him, since that communication to Him was a proper generation, therefore He is *the begotten* Son of God; and since the same essence was never so by way of *generation* communicated to any [other], therefore He is the *Only-begotten;* distinguished from the *Holy Ghost* as *Son*, from the *adopted* children as the *natural* Son.

Practical uses of Belief in Christ as the Only Son of God.

182. This belief is necessary: (*a*) For the confirmation of our faith concerning the redemption of mankind. The dignity of the Mediator's person assures us of an infinite efficacy in His actions and sufferings. "It is *not possible* that the blood of *bulls* &c. should take away sins;" Heb. x. 4. and we may well *doubt* how the blood of a *man*, if a *mere* man, can take away the sins of other men..... But we may well believe the blood of *Christ*, being the "blood of *God*," a sufficiently "precious" "price" for us to be "bought with," (see 1 Cor. vi. 20. vii. 23. 1 Pet. i. 19. Acts xx. 28.) and efficacious to "purge our conscience from dead works," since Christ "offered up Himself through the Eternal Spirit;" Heb. ix. 14. Every one of our sins is against God; and the gravity of every offence increases in proportion to the dignity of the party offended in respect of the offender, because the more worthy a person is, the more reverence is due to him, &c. Again, the value of reparation for offence arises from the dignity of the person satisfying; the honour in which the satisfaction consists increasing proportionably as the person satisfying is honourable. If then by every sin we have offended God, who is of *infinite* eminency, how shall we be secure of reconciliation, unless the person making reparation be of the same infinite dignity, so that the honour rendered by His obedience may be proportionable to the dishonour which arose from our

---

182, What are the practical uses of belief in Christ as the *only Son of God?* Quote texts throughout. 182. (*b*) Distinguish different degrees of idolatry according to

disobedience? This scruple can only be satisfied by belief in the Mediator of such dignity as the Only-begotten Son of God.—(*b*) For our confirmation in ascribing to Christ the honour due to Him. God the Father "hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men shall honour the Son, even as they honour the Father; John v. 22, 23. "..... Blessing, &c. be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever:" Rev. v. 13. Again, we are commanded "to fear the Lord our God, and to serve Him," Deut. x. 20. with an emphasis implying Him alone, because "the Lord our God is one Lord;" vi. 4. .....A precept equally valid under the Gospel as under the Law, being used by our Saviour against the Tempter....."Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve;" Matt. iv. 10. If then we be bound to worship the God of Israel only, and commanded also to give the same worship to the Son, we must believe that the Son is the God of Israel. The same Scripture which, when it "bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, saith, Let all the angels of God worship Him," Heb. i. 6. also calleth that first-begotten "Jehovah," and "the Lord of the whole earth;" Psal. xcvii. 5. For a man to worship that as God, which *is not* God, *knowing* that it *is not* God, is gross idolatry; to worship that as God which *is not* God, *thinking* that it *is* God, is the same sin, in a less degree; to worship Him as God who *is* God, *thinking* that He *is not* God, is an act in the formality not void of idolatry. Lest therefore we, while obliged to give Him Divine worship, should fall into idolatry, we must believe Him that eternal God whom.....only we should serve.—(*c*) To raise us to a thankful acknowledgment of the infinite love of God appearing in the sending of His only-begotten Son to die for sinners. "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son;" John iii. 16. "God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us;" in that "He spared not His own Son, &c." Rom. v. 8. viii. 32. See also 1 John iv. 9, 10. If we look on all this as nothing but that God should cause a man to be born after another

---

the Godhead or otherwise of the object of worship, and the (knowledge or) belief of the worshipper in reference thereto. How does belief in Christ as the *Only Son of God* secure us from falling into idolatry with respect to Him?

manner than other men, and deliver him, a mortal man, though so born, to die for the sins of the world, there appears no such great expression of His love in this way of redemption more than would have appeared had He redeemed us any other way. It is true that considering the *free* goodness of God in our redemption as well as our creation, and the immensity of the benefit conferred, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God, even in the act of redemption itself; but yet the Apostles have heightened that consideration, and placed the choicest mark of the love of God in His choosing such means, and performing in that manner our reparation by sending, not sparing, &c. His own Son: and the estimation of this act of God's love must increase proportionably to the dignity of the Son so sent, &c. because the more worthy the person of Christ before He suffered, the greater His condescension to such a condition; and the nearer His relation to the Father, the greater the Father's love to us, for whose sakes He sent Him to suffer. Wherefore to derogate from the nature of our Saviour before He suffered is so far to undervalue the love of God, and consequently to come short of due thanksgiving, &c.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. II. §. 3.

183. I believe as a certain and necessary truth that Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Messias, is the true, proper, and natural, Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father; which being incapable of division or multiplication is so really and totally communicated to Him that He is of the same essence with Him, "God of God, &c." And I .... exclude all other persons from that kind of Sonship, acknowledging none but Him to be begotten of God by that proper and natural generation, *excluding* all *not begotten*, as it is a *generation*; all said to be *begotten* and called *sons*, but being so only by *adoption*, as it is *natural*. Thus I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ HIS ONLY SON.

---

183. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in Christ as the *Only Son of God*.

Art. II. §. 4. OUR LORD.

184. The only Son must needs be heir and Lord of all in His Father's house; and all others named sons, whether men or angels, if compared to Him, must not be looked on as sons of God, but servants of Christ. For the explication of this part of the Article it is required;

185. I. To ascertain the *proper notation* of the word *Lord* in Scripture language.—"The Lord" alone, absolutely taken, is frequently used by the Apostles and Evangelists for Christ; Mark xvi. 19, 20. Luke xii. 42. John iv. 1. Acts ix. *passim*, &c. The angels say, "come see the place where the Lord lay;" Matt. xxviii. 6. For the true notation of the word it will not be so necessary to investigate the Greek or correspondent Latin, as to search into the notion of the Jews, and the language of the Scriptures, according to which the Evangelists, &c. spoke and wrote.

186. The word indeed which we translate *the Lord* (Κύριος) was used by the interpreters of the Old Testament, and writers of the New, sometimes for men, with relation to merely human dominion.* But most certainly Christ is also called *Lord* in *another* sense, because in *that* "there are *many*

184, 185, 192, 198. What is required for the explication of *our Lord* in Art. II? 185. Quote some of the texts in which *the Lord* alone, absolutely taken, is in the New Testament used for Christ What is chiefly required to ascertain the true notation of the word? 186. Shew that *the Lord* (Κύριος), though sometimes used in the Septuagint and New Testament with relation to dominion merely human, is certainly also used of Christ in a far higher sense.

* See many texts quoted by Pearson in note.—It is hardly needful to observe that our Saviour is sometimes addressed as Lord by those who were unacquainted with His divinity. *G.*

lords ;" 1 Cor. viii. 5. but *He* is Lord in that notion which admits of no more than *One;* ver. 6., and Eph. iv. 5. *They* are only "masters "according to the flesh ;" Col. iii. 22. *He* "the "Lord of glory," "the Lord from heaven," 1 Cor. ii. 8. and xv. 47. "Lord of lords ;" Rev. xix. 16.

187. 1. That name is easily to be found in the books of the Law in the most high and full signification ; being most frequently used as the name of the supreme God, sometimes for *El* or *Elohim*, sometimes for *Shaddai* or the *Rock*, often for *Adonai*, most universally for *Jehovah*, the *proper* name of God, and that to which the Greek translators had most *appropriated* the name of *Lord:* "Thou whose name alone is *Jehovah*, &c." Psal lxxxiii. 18. "I appeared unto Abraham, &c. by the name of *God Almighty;* (El Shaddai ;) but by My name *Jehovah* was I not known to them ;" Exod. vi. 3. In both these places the Greek translation, which the Apostles followed, had for *Jehovah* no other name but *Lord;* therefore by it they doubtless understood the proper name of God, *Jehovah.* Nor could they have used it there truly as the exposition of any other name of God ; for He *was* known to Abraham by the true importance of the title *Adonai* as much as by the name *Shaddai;* as much by His sovereignty as His all-sufficiency; but by any experimental and personal sense of the fulfilling of His promises His name *Jehovah* was *not* known to him. For He gave him none inheritance in the land which He had promised to give

---

187. How is that name most frequently used in the books of the Law ? for what names, and most universally for *what name*, of God ? "I appeared unto Abraham, &c. by the name of God Almighty ; but by my name *Jehovah* was I not known to them ;" Exod. vi. 3. How does Pearson explain this passage ? What is the (equivalent) etymology

to him and his seed. See Acts vii. 5. Gen. xiii. 15. and xxvi. 3.....We have reason then to believe that the word thus used by the first Greek translators, and afterwards by the Apostles, may be appropriated to that notion which the original requires; as indeed it may, being of equivalent etymology, (יהוה, *Jehovah*, from היה, *to be*; Κύριος, *Lord*, from *κύρω*, *to be*;) and so denoting the *essence*, or *existence*, of God, and whatsoever else may be deduced thence, as revealed by Him to be signified thereby.

188. Since then this title *Lord* thus signifies the proper name of God, *Jehovah*, and is certainly *attributed* to *Christ* in a notion far surpassing all other lords, it must next be enquired whether as it is the *translation* of *Jehovah* it belong to *Christ*: or whether He, though Lord of all other lords, be yet so inferior to *Him* whose name *alone* is *Jehovah*, as that it may *not* be attributed to *Christ* in the same propriety, &c. as to the *supreme* God.

189. The doubt will easily be satisfied, if we can shew the *name Jehovah itself* to be given to our Saviour: we cannot *acknowledge* the *original name* and *deny* the *interpretation* in the full importance of that original. Wherefore if Christ be the *Jehovah*, as so called by the Spirit of God, then is He so the *Lord*, in the *same propriety*, &c. as *Jehovah* is. Now whatsoever belonged to the *Messias* must be attributed to *Jesus*, the true and only Christ. But the Jews themselves acknowledge that *Jehovah*.....is the name which properly belongs to the Messias.....If *they* could see "Jehovah the Lord of Hosts," to be the name

---

of יהוה and of Κύριος? 188, 189. Shew from comparison of Scripture passages (in resolution of the doubt whether *Lord* as the *translation* of *Jehovah* belong to *Christ*? or

of the Messias, who was to *them* "for a stone of stumbling, &c." Isaiah viii. 13, 14. how can *we* be ignorant of it, taught by St Paul that in *Christ* this prophecy was fulfilled, "...Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling stone &c. and whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed;" Rom. ix. 33. If was no other than Jehovah who said, "I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord (Jehovah) their God, and...not...by bow nor sword;" Hos. i. 7. where not only He who is described as the *original cause*, (i. e. the Father, who gave His Son,) but also He who is the *immediate efficient* of our salvation, and that in opposition to all other means, is called *Jehovah;* who can be none but *Jesus*, because "there is no other name under heaven given unto men whereby we must be saved;" Acts iv. 12. Again, "I will strengthen them in the Lord (Jehovah), and they shall walk up and down in His name, saith the Lord;" (Jehovah,) Zech. x. 12. where He who strengtheneth and He by whom He strengtheneth are clearly distinguished, yet *each* of them is *Jehovah*, and "Jehovah our God is *one* Jehovah;" Deut. vi. 4.....We know Christ is the "righteous branch raised unto David, &c." and are assured that "this is His name whereby He shall be called, *Jehovah* our Righteousness;" Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. If the words, "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Sion; for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord," (Jehovah,) did not (they do) sufficiently of themselves denote our Saviour who dwelt among us, yet the words following would evince as much; "And many

---

whether if so, it belongs to *Him* in the same propriety as to the supreme God?) that the *original Jehovah* is by the prophets applied to Christ.

nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be My people ; and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent Me unto thee ;" Zech. ii. 10, 11. What *other Lord* can we conceive *so dwelling*, *so sent*, but Christ ?

190. And as the *original Jehovah* was spoken of *Christ* by the *prophets*, so the title of *Lord*, as the usual *interpretation* of it was attributed to Him by the *Apostles*.—i. In that signal prediction of the first age of the gospel God promised by Joel, that "whosoever shall call on the name of the *Lord* (Jehovah) shall be delivered ;" Joel ii. 32. and St Paul hath assured us that *Christ* is that *Lord* by proving from *thence* [quoting that text], Rom. x. 13. that "whosoever believeth on *Him* shall not be ashamed," ver. 11. and inferring from *that*, "if we confess with our mouth the Lord Jesus we shall be saved :" ver. 9. For if it be a certain truth that whosoever confesseth the Lord Jesus shall be saved, ver. 9. and the certainty of this truth depend on that foundation, that "whosoever believeth on *Him* shall not be ashamed," ver. 11. and the certainty of *that* in relation to *Christ* depend on that other promise, "whosoever shall call on the name of the *Lord* shall be saved," ver. 13. then must the *Lord* ver. 13. be the same with the *Lord Jesus*, ver. 9. But the *Lord* ver. 13.* is no other than *Jehovah*, as appears by the therein quoted prophet Joel.—ii. We know that John the Baptist "was he of whom it is written" in the prophet Malachi, "I will send My messenger, and he shall prepare the

---

190. Shew similarly that *Lord* as the usual *interpretation* of *Jehovah* is attributed to Christ by the Apostles.

* The *thirteenth* verse must (I take it) be here meant, though Pearson here has *ninth*. G.

way before Me;" Matt. xi. 10. we are sure He who spake these words was "(*Jehovah*) the Lord of Hosts;" Mal. iii. 1. and as sure that *Christ* is that *Lord* before whose face John the Baptist prepared the way: "The voice of Him that crieth in the wilderness," saith Isaiah, (xl. 3.) "Prepare ye the way of the Lord" (Jehovah): and "this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah;" Matt. iii. 3. he of whom his father prophesied, "Thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways;" Luke i. 76. where Christ is certainly the *Lord*, and the *Lord* undeniably *Jehovah*.

191. 2. *Lord* taken in a sense Divine is also often used as the interpretation of *Adon* or *Adonai*.—i. "The Lord said unto my Lord," saith David, Psal. cx. 1. in the original *Jehovah* (יהוה) to *Adon* (אדון) and that *Adon* is *the Word*, that *Lord* is *Christ*.—ii. The temple at Jerusalem was the temple of the Most High God, and the *Lord* of that temple (in the emphasis of an Hebrew article) was *Christ*: "The Lord (האדון) whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, &c." Mal. iii. 1.——Now this notation as the interpretation of *Adon* signifies properly *dominion*, implying a right of possession, and power of disposing. Which not only agrees with, but presupposes, that other notion of *Jehovah*. For He who alone hath existence of Himself, and thereby is the fountain of all other things, must have full power and dominion over all, for every thing must

---

191. Shew that *Lord* in a *Divine* sense is attributed to *Christ* as the interpretation of *Adon*. How does the notion of *Adon* agree with and presuppose that other notion of Jehovah?

belong to Him from whom it hath received what it is. Wherefore, since *Christ* is the *Lord* as that title is taken for *Jehovah*, the name of God expressing His necessary existence, &c., He must also be acknowledged the *Lord* as that name expresses *Adon*, signifying power authoritative, dominion.

192. II. To declare the *full signification* of the *Lordship* of *Christ*. As we have observed *two natures* united in Christ's *Person*, we must also consider *two kinds* of *dominion*, belonging respectively to those natures, one *inherent* in His *Divinity*, the other *bestowed* on His *humanity*.

193. 1. "The Word was *God*;" by that same Word "all things were made, &c." John i. 1, 3. The Word then, that is, *Christ* as *God*, hath *direct*, supreme, and universal, dominion over all things as belonging to Him their *Creator*. Well expressed by no longer doubting...Thomas, "My *Lord* and my *God!*" John xx. 28.

194. 2. There was also some kind of Lordship *bestowed* on *Christ*, whose very unction proves an *imparted* dominion; He was "*made* both *Lord* and *Christ*;" Acts ii. 36. What David spake of *man* (Psal. viii. 5, 6.) the Apostle applies *peculiarly* to *Him*, "Thou crownedst Him with glory and honour, and didst set Him over the works of Thy hands, &c." Heb. ii. 7, 8.

195. Now a dominion thus *bestowed cannot* be that which belongs to God as *God*, the Divine nature being absolute and independent. Wherefore this *imparted* and *acquired* Lordship appertains to the *human* nature, and belongs to our Saviour as the

---

192. What *two kinds* of *dominion* belong to Christ? 193. In what nature has He dominion as Creator of all things? 194, 195. In what nature as "made Lord and Christ?" 195. Name some principal branches of the dominion belonging to Christ in respect of His *acquired*

Son of *man*. Branches of this dominion are α. The right of *judicature;* the Father "hath given Him authority to execute judgment, because He is the Son of man;" John v. 27. and by this delegated authority "the Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father, &c." Matt. xvi. 27.—β. The power of *forgiving sins:*.....Christ said to the sick of the palsy, "Thy sins be forgiven thee, that we might know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins;" Matt. ix. 2, 6.—γ. The *alteration* of the *Law;*.....Christ asserted Himself to be "greater than the Temple," shewing that "the Son of man was Lord even of the sabbath day;" Matt. xii. 6, 8.

196. *This* dominion *given* to *Christ* in His *human* nature (*a*) Had *not all* the *same beginning* as to possession. For though Jesus knew before His death that "the Father had given all things into His hands," John xiii. 3. yet in the same place it is written, that He knew "that He was come from God and went to God;"—Part of the power He received when He *came from* God, to *enable* Him;—part when He *went to* God, to enable and *reward* Him also. "For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living;" Rom. xiv. 9. After His resurrection He said, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth;" Matt. xxviii. 18. "He drank of the brook in the way, therefore He hath lift up His head;" Psal. cx. 7. Because "He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death.....therefore God hath also highly exalted Him, and given Him a name

---

Lordship. Quote requisite texts. 196. Shew that the dominion given to Christ in His *human* nature had *not all* the *same beginning;* distinguishing between different parts of it, and the different times of His receiving them. Quote texts.

which is above every name, &c. that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father;" Phil. ii. 8. &c., thus, even as the Son of *man*, exalted, but by the *Father*, who "raised Him from the dead, &c. &c. and hath put all things under His feet, &c." Eph. i. 20, &c.

197. (*b*) *Nor* shall have the *same duration*. For, i. Part of it being merely *œconomical*, aiming at a certain end, shall *cease* on the accomplishment of that end. Of this David spake, "The Lord said unto My Lord, sit Thou at My right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool;" Psal. cx. 1. And as we are assured of the *continuation* of Christ's dominion over His enemies till their total subjection, "for He must reign till He hath put all things under His feet;" 1 Cor. xv. 25. so are we also of the *resignation* of it at that time. For "when He shall have put down all rule, &c. then shall He deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father. And.....then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all;" 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.—But ii. Part being either due on the *union* of the *human* nature with the Divine, or on covenant as a reward for the sufferings endured in *that* nature, must be coeval with that *union* and that *nature*, consequently *eternal*. We must not look on Christ only as a commissioned general, or an instructed ambassador, but as the *only son* of God, empowered and employed to destroy the enemies of His Father's kingdom: and though thus empowered, &c. and resigning that authority which had already had its perfect work, yet

---

197. Distinguish between parts of the same dominion in reference to *difference* in *duration*. Shew that "*for ever*" (Heb.), though *not necessarily* signifying *absolute eternity*,

still the only Son and heir of all things, never to relinquish His dominion over those whom He hath bought with His blood, nor the reward assigned Him for His sufferings. If *we* expect... an *incorruptible* crown, &c.....then *cannot His perfect* obedience be crowned with a *fading* power, &c.....He will make us kings and priests ; but so that He still continue ever *High* Priest, and *King of kings.*——The certainty of this eternal dominion we may well ground on the promise made to David, because by reason of that promise Christ Himself is called David : "I will set up one shepherd over them,.....even my servant David ; he shall feed them, &c. and I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them ;" Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24. The promise was thus made expressly to David, "Thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee ; thy throne shall be established for ever;" 2 Sam. vii. 16. And though that term "*for ever*" עד עולם may signify often no more than a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable, or at the utmost but to the end of all things, and so the *œconomical* dominion may be thought to fulfil that promise,.....yet sometimes also it signifies *absolute* eternity *without end:* and it is certainly so far to be extended particularly in that promise made to David, and to be fulfilled in His Son. Clearly so expounded by the angel Gabriel ; "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His Father David ; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end ;" Luke i. 32, 33. And foreseen in vision by Daniel ;.....

---

yet sometimes has that sense ; and that it must in that sense apply to a part (which ?) of the dominion given to Christ in His *human* nature. Quote requisite texts.

"behold, one like the son of man.....came to the Ancient of days,.....And there was given Him dominion, &c. that all people.....should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, &c." Dan. vii. 13, 14.

198. III. To enquire *whose Lord* Christ is, and *how ours.*

199. 1. He is our Lord, because "He is *Lord of all,*' Acts x. 36. of all things and all persons: which He must be who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as Man. To Him all things, *God only* necessarily *excepted,* (1 Cor. xv. 27.) are subject; in heaven "all the angels of God worship Him;" Heb. i. 6. on earth "all nations are His inheritance, &c." Psal. ii. 8.

200. 2. He is *our* Lord; not only because we are created by Him, as are also the lowest of His creatures, and preserved by Him who also feedeth the ravens, &c. but *peculiarly* by right of (*a*) *Redemption,* which comprises a *double* title to a most just dominion, *α.* of *conquest;* we were first servants to the enemy of God; for him we obeyed, "and his servants we are to whom we obey;" Rom. vi. 16. when "Christ through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil, and delivered us, He spoiled principalities, &c." Heb. ii. 14. Col. ii. 15. *β.* of *purchase;* For contrary to the custom of triumphing conquerors, He did not *sell,* but *buy* us: while He saved us, He died for us, and that death was the price by which He purchased us: &c.—(*b*) *Promotion.* Whatsoever we have we received from Him as Master of the family; we hold of Him all temporal and eternal blessings. He is "the Prince of Life," Acts iii. 15. and by Him we live; "the Lord of

---

199. How is Christ in a *general* sense *our Lord?*
200. In what respects *peculiarly our Lord?*

"glory;" 1 Cor. ii. 8. and we are "called by His gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord;" 2 Thess. ii. 14.—(*c*) *Obligation.* Anciently men were sold.....sometimes by themselves; and whoever of us truly believe in Christ have given up our names to Him. In our baptismal vow we bind ourselves to His service, that henceforth we will not serve sin, but yield ourselves unto God, &c. Rom. vi. 6, 13, 19. And thus Christ's dominion over us is acknowledged by compact and confirmed by covenant.

Practical uses of Belief in Christ as Our Lord.

201. This belief is necessary: (*a*) To assure us that we are not our own, neither our persons nor our actions. "Know ye not that ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price;" 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. Ancient servitude, to which the Scriptures relate, put the servants *wholly* in the *possession* of their master. We then, if so in respect of Christ, may not live to ourselves, but to Him; (see Rom. xiv. 7, 8.) we cannot do our own wills, but the will of Him whose we are. Christ took on Him the form of a servant; and to give a perfect example of that condition tells us "I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me;" John vi. 38. (*b*) *a.* To *enforce* us to obedience. As His servants we must "bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of "Christ;" 2 Cor. x. 5. He who therefore died and rose, &c. that He might become the Lord both of the dead and living, makes his death and resurrection efficacious only to such as by their service acknowledge the dominion which He purchased. ". He is become the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him;" Heb. v. 8, 9.—*β.* To *invite* us to obedience: When God gave the Law with fire and thunder, the affrighted Israelites desired to receive it from *Moses*, and on that receipt promised obedience; "Go thou near, &c." Deut. v. 27..... How then should *we* be invited to the same promise and a

---

201. What are the practical uses of belief in Christ as *our Lord?* Quote requisite texts.

better performance, who have received the whole will of God revealed to us by the Son of man, and are to give an account of our performance to the same Man set down at the right hand of the Father! He.....became our brother that.....He might be made our Lord. Shall not we with all readiness submit to the divine dominion given to Him who also gave Himself for us? &c. (*c*) For the regulation of all power, authority, &c. on earth, in respect both of those who rule and those who obey. *α.* Hence the most absolute monarchs learn that the people they rule are not their own, but the subjects of a greater Prince by Him committed to their charge..... "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven;" Col. iv. 1. God allowed the Israelites to make of their brethren hired servants, but not slaves;..... ... "for they are My servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen;" Lev. xxv. 42. What tenderness then is due to those who are servants of that Lord who redeemed them with a higher price from a greater bondage?— *β.* Hence they who are subject learn to obey the powers of human ordination, because in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects are related to their Governors as servants to their masters; and St Paul saith, "Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ;" Col. iii. 22, &c. Whence we learn, as *whom*, so also *how*, to obey: .....we regulate our obedience to them by our service due to the one Lord in heaven, the Lord of lords; and so are always ready to obey, but *in the Lord.*—(*d*) For our comfort and encouragement. He, being Lord of all, can dispose of all things for the benefit of His servants. He who commanded the winds and seas, multiplied the loaves and fishes, &c. hath all creatures now under exact obedience; wherefore none can want whom He undertakes to provide for: "For the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him;" Rom. x. 12. The enemies of His servants are *His* enemies, and shall be made His footstool. The lusts of our flesh which war in our members are powerful, but His grace is sufficient for us, &c. The afflictions we are called to undergo for His sake are heavy: but if we suffer with Him, we shall reign together with Him, &c.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. II. §. 4.

202. I assent to this as a certain truth, that Jesus Christ the only Son of God is the true Jehovah, who* hath that being, which is originally and eternally of itself, and on which all other beings depend; that by right of emanation of all other things from Him He hath absolute, &c, power over all things as *God;* that as *Man* He is *invested* with all power in heaven and earth; partly *œconomical,* for the completing of our redemption and the destruction of our enemies, to continue to the end of all things, and *then* to be *resigned* to the Father, partly *consequent* on the *union* [of His human to His Divine nature], or due to the *obedience* of His passion, and so *eternal,* as belonging to that kingdom which shall have no end. And though He be thus Lord of all things by creation and preservation of them, yet is He more *peculiarly* the Lord of *us* who by faith are consecrated to His service; for through our *Redemption* He becomes our Lord by right both of conquest and purchase; and making us the Sons of God, and providing heavenly mansions for us, He acquires a further right of *Promotion,* which, by that covenant we make to serve Him, is completed in the right of a voluntary *Obligation.* Thus I believe in *Christ* OUR LORD.

ART. III. Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

203. These words, as they now stand, clearly *distinguish* the *conception* of Jesus from His *nativity;* whereas the ancient Creeds had only "*who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary;*" or "*of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary;*" understanding by the word "*born,*' however, *not only* the *nativity,* but *also* the *conception* and *generation*.....—Three persons are now to be

---

202. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in Christ as *Our Lord.* 203. How did the ancient Creeds express ART. III.? and how must their

* "*Who;*" i. e. not Jesus Christ, but *Jehovah.* Jesus Christ is not *self*-originated [see par. 176.], but He is one with the self-originated Jehovah. *Dr. Burton.*

considered, as far as concerned in this Article: 1. He who was conceived and born; 2. He by whose operation He was conceived; 3. She who did conceive and bear Him.

§. 1. WHICH WAS CONCEIVED.....BORN.

204. I. This Article as connected with the former imports that He which was begotten by the Father before all worlds was now in the fulness of time "conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary." And since by this conception and birth is to be understood whatsoever was done toward the production of the human nature of our Saviour, we evidently here meet with the incarnation of the Son of God; that great mystery wrapt up in St John's short sentence, "The Word was made flesh."—The connecting pronoun relates both to this and the following Articles: He who was *conceived* and *born*, and so made man, did in that human nature suffer, die, and rise again. Now since this was the Word, and that Word was God, and whosoever is God cannot cease to be so, it must follow that He was made man by joining the human nature with the Divine. But.....though the human nature was conjoined with the Divinity, which is the nature common to the Father and the Son, yet was that union made only in the *person* of the *Son*. The Patripassian* heretics made the Father to be

---

language be understood so as to be equivalent in meaning with the words as they now stand? 204. What is the import of this Article as connected with the preceding? How far does the force of the connecting pronoun extend in reference to the following Articles? How was Christ made man? In what only Person of the Trinity was made the union of the human nature with the Divine? Who was the founder of the Patripassian heresy? How

* Founded chiefly by Praxeas, in the second century, and named from holding that the *Father suffered*.

incarnate and crucified; always thought to be sufficiently confuted by this very creed, where the Incarnation is not subjoined to the first, but to the *second* Article. It is.....the *Son which was conceived*, &c.—He then who was made flesh was not the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, nor any other person but the only begotten Son.

205. II. The Word *conceived* and *born*, was *thus* made really and truly *man*, of the same nature which is in all other men, who by ordinary generation are conceived and born. The "Mediator between God and man is the *man* Christ Jesus;" that "since by man came death, by man also should come the resurrection of the dead;" 1 Cor. xv. 21. The second Adam is as certainly man as the first.....He is therefore frequently called the *son of man* and in that nature He was always promised: first to Eve as *her seed*,.....then to Abraham, "In thy seed, &c." Gen. xxii. 18; Gal. iii. 16. next to David as his son, &c. and so "the son of David, the son of Abraham," Matt. i. 1; *see* Rom. i. 3. consequently of the same nature with them. And.....we are His brethren, as descending from the same father Adam; and therefore "it behoved Him to be made" man "like unto His brethren," Heb. ii. 17; *and see* 16.—As then man consists of two parts, body and soul, so doth Christ.

206. 1. He assumed a *body*, at His conception, of the blessed Virgin. "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, &c." Heb. ii. 14. The verity of His body stands on the truth of His nativity; and the actions and passions of

---

is it inconsistent with the words of this Creed? 205. What is Christ often called in reference to His manhood? To what persons was He in His human nature promised as a descendant? As real and perfect man, of what two parts doth Christ consist? 206. Shew that

His life shew the nature of His flesh.—He was first born with a body *prepared for Him*, of the same appearance with those of other infants; He grew up by degrees, and "came eating and drinking," and when He did not so, suffered hunger and thirst. Those plowers who "ploughed upon His back and made long furrows," the thorns which pricked His temples, the nails which penetrated His hands and feet, and the spear which pierced His side, testify the natural tenderness and frailty of His flesh. And lest His miraculous fasting, and walking on the water, and His sudden standing in the midst of His disciples when the doors were shut, should raise an opinion that His body was not truly flesh, He confirmed first His own disciples, "Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have;" Luke xxiv. 39.—"Every spirit that *confesseth* that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh* is *of God:* and every spirit that *confesseth not*.....is *not of God;*" 1 John iv. 2, 3. Christ both God and man, was as soon denied to be man* (first by Simon Magus) as God.

207. 2. Christ assumed a human *soul*.....For "Jesus increased in *wisdom* and stature;" Luke ii. 52.....the one of His body, the other of His soul. *Wisdom* belongeth *not* to the *flesh, nor* can *God's infinite* knowledge *increase;* He then whose knowledge increased with His years must have a subject proper for it, which was no other than His human soul. This was the seat of His finite understanding and directed will, distinct

---

Christ assumed a real human body. Quote requisite texts. By what heretics (first by whom?) was the humanity of Christ denied? 207. Shew that Christ assumed a real human soul. Quote texts. What heretics

* By the Docetæ, who imagined that Christ was man only in *appearance.*

from the will of His Father, and consequently of His Divine nature ;....."Not My will, but Thine be done ;" Luke xxii. 42. This was the subject of the affections and passions so manifest in Him ;....."My soul is exceeding sorrowful, &c." Matt. xxvi. 38. Of this on the cross "He said, Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit ; and having said thus, He gave up the ghost ;" Luke xxiii. 46. And as His death was the separation of His soul from His body, so did His life as man consist in the vital union of that soul with that body. So that He which was "perfect God" was also "perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." (In opposition to the ancient heretics* who taught that Christ assumed human flesh, but that the Word or His Divinity was to that body in the place of an informing soul.)

208. III. Thus the Word, which before had the unchangeable Divine nature, assumed the whole human nature,.....and so really and truly was *both God* and *man*. These *two natures* then are really *distinct* in Christ incarnate.—If both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in Christ, it must be either by commixtion of both into one, or by conversion of one into the other. But neither of these ways can consist with His Person or office.

209. 1. *Not commixtion ;* for so He were *neither God nor man*, but a person of a nature *different*

---

held that the Word supplied in Christ's flesh the place of an informing soul? 208, 209. Shew that the Divine and human natures in Christ are *distinct : not* being *confounded* by *commixtion.*

* The Arians and Apollinarians. Arius taught that Christ had nothing of man but the flesh, and with that the Word was joined. Apollinaris (Bishop of Laodicea in the fourth century,) distinguished between the *soul*, ψυχή, and *mind*, νοῦς, allowing that Christ assumed the *former*, but that the Word was in the place of the *latter*.

from *both*, as all mixed bodies are distinct from each of their composing elements. Besides, the human affections and infirmities in Christ cannot be conceived to belong to that nature of which the Divine was but a part. Nor could our humanity be so commixed with the Divinity of our Saviour but that the Father had been made man as much as the Son, because the Divine nature is the same of both. Nor ought we to esteem that Infinite Being so meanly as to think it commixed with, or immersed in, the creature.

210. 2. *Not conversion :* - (*a*) We must not suppose a *conversion* of the *Divine* nature of Christ into the *human;* for the nature of *man* must be *made*, the nature of *God cannot* be *made*, consequently cannot become the nature of man. The *immaterial, indivisible.....Godhead cannot* be *divided* into a *spiritual...soul* and a *carnal...body;* of which two humanity consists. There is *no other* Deity of the *Father* than of the *Son;* therefore if *this* was converted into that *humanity*, then was the *Father also* that *man*, &c. We must not therefore so far stand on the propriety of speech when it is written, "The Word was made flesh,"* as to destroy the propriety both of the Word and the flesh.—(*b*) We must not suppose a *conversion* of the *human* nature into the *Divine;* for it is unimaginable how that which *had no being* should be *made* by being *turned into something else.* Therefore the humanity of Christ could not *at first* be made by being the Divinity of the Word.

---

210. *Nor changed,* either into the other, by *conversion* "The Word was made flesh." What very different erroneous interpretations, and by whom, have been made of ἐγένετο in this passage? What argument did the ancient fathers draw, in opposition to the Eutychian heresy from

* The Socinians would have ἐγένετο here to be simply "*fuit;*" the Flandrian Anabaptists stretched it to the *highest sense* "*factum est.*"

And there is no pretence of any *subsequent* time or manner of such transubstantiation. The ancient Fathers who opposed the *Eutychian* heresy* [here refuted] well made use of the Sacramental union between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, thereby shewing that the human nature is no more really converted into the Divinity, and so ceases to be the human nature, than the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the body and blood, and thereby ceases to be bread and wine. (Whence it is evident that the Church then understood no such doctrine as that of *Transubstantiation*.)

211. [Conclusion from I. II. III.] Since then He which is *conceived* was the only begotten Son of God, and so always subsisting in the Divine nature; since by the same conception He was made truly man, and consequently assumed the human nature; since these two natures cannot be made one either by commixtion or conversion, and yet there can be but one Christ subsisting in them both, because that only Son was He which is conceived and born; it follows that the union not made in the nature was made in the Person of the Word, *i. e.* so made *not* that out of *both natures one* [nature] only should result, *but* that to *one Person no other* [Person] should be added.

212. This union is.....a necessary truth; without which we cannot have one but two Christs; cannot make the second and third Articles of our Creed equally belong to the same Person; cannot interpret the Scriptures, nor understand our

---

the *sacramental* union between the bread and wine and Christ's body and blood? (What is hence evident as to the doctrine of Transubstantiation?) Who was the founder of the Eutychian heresy? 211. Give a brief summary of the arguments whence it is concluded that the union of *two distinct natures* was made in the *one Person* of the Word. 212. Shew the importance of the true notion

* Founded by Eutyches, head of a monastery in Constantinople in the fifth century.

Saviour's history. For He which was before Abraham was in the days of Herod born of a woman; He who preached in the days of Noah began to preach in the reign of Tiberius, being then about thirty years old; He was demonstrated the Son of God with power who was the seed of David according to the flesh; He who died on the cross raised from the dead Him who died so; (*see* 1 Pet. iii. 18.) He was "of the fathers according to the flesh" who was "God over all blessed for ever;" Rom. ix. 5. Since such actions and affections cannot come from the same nature yet must be attributed to the same person, we must acknowledge as a *diversity* of *natures* united, so the *identity* of the *Person* in whom they are conjoined: (against the heresy of the Nestorians.*)

[See "Practical Uses, &c.," and "Summary of Truths, &c.," at the end of next Section.]

ART. III. §. 2. CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY GHOST.

213. The *Person* or existence of the *Holy Ghost*..... will be *directly* considered in Article V. And as to the *conception itself*, that belongs not so properly to the Holy Ghost, of whom the act cannot be predicted. For though Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, yet the Holy Ghost did not conceive Him, but said to the Virgin, "*Thou* shalt conceive." There remains therefore nothing here to be considered but that operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception whereby the Virgin was enabled to conceive, and by virtue whereof Christ is said to be *conceived by* Him.—

---

respecting this union. Who was the founder of the Nestorian heresy? 213. "Conceived by the Holy Ghost." What is the *only* subject for *direct* consideration in this section? And why so?

* Founded by Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople in the fifth century.

As to which must be observed,

214. I. What is *excluded* by that attribution to the Spirit. When the blessed Virgin was told by the angel that she should conceive, &c. she said, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Thus she excluded 1. *All men*: "I know not a man." Our Melchizedech had no earthly father; no man: particularly, not Joseph. "His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph;" but "before they came together, she was found with child by the Holy Ghost;" Matt. i. 18. "The parents," who "brought the child Jesus into the Temple;" Luke ii. 27. were *not* the *father* and mother, but "*Joseph* and His mother." Philip indeed calls Him....."The son of Joseph;" John i. 45. and His mother said to Him, "Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing;" Luke ii. 48. but this must be only the *reputed* father of Christ, He being only "as was *supposed*, the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli;" Luke iii. 23. It is absurd therefore to affirm our Saviour to have been the *proper* son of *Joseph* because the genealogy belongs to *him*, whereas in the beginning of that genealogy Joseph is called the *supposed* father; or to account it necessary Christ should be the true son of Joseph to be known to be the son of David; since in the same place where it is proved that Joseph came from David it is denied that Christ came from Joseph: and that not only in St Luke where Joseph begins, but in St Matthew where he ends, the genealogy, "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom [*fem.*] was born Jesus who is called Christ;" Matt. i. 16. Whether the one genealogy belong to Joseph, the other to Mary, or both to Joseph, it is from other parts of Scripture certain

---

214. What is *excluded* by attributing the conception of Christ to the Spirit? Quote requisite texts.

that Christ not only descended lineally from David according to the flesh, but also was begotten of the Virgin Mary, and not by Joseph.—2. *Herself:* "How shall this be, seeing.....?" shewing that of herself she could not cause such conception..... Though Eve were the mother of all living, yet generation was founded on the Divine benediction given to both together: for "God blessed them, and said unto them, be fruitful &c." Gen. i. 28. Though Christ was promised as the *seed of the woman*, yet it was not in the power of woman to conceive Him.....God then it was, "for with God nothing shall be impossible," Luke i. 37. who immediately and miraculously enabled the blessed Virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while Mary, Joseph, and all men are denied, no person which is that God can be excluded from that operation.

215. II. What is *included* in the conception by the Holy Ghost. 1. But what this is, or how His operation is to be distinguished from the conception of the Virgin, is not so easily determined. i. The words expressing it in Scripture are very general: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;" Luke i. 35.—"When His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost;" Matt. i. 18.—"Joseph,.....fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost;" i. 20.....ii. Still less can we decide the question by that late distinction, made in this Article, "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin;" because the same Virgin also

---

215. What is *included* in the conception by the Holy Ghost? Quote requisite texts. How is it manifest that Christ was not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost?

conceived Him; "Thou shalt conceive and bear a Son." iii. Neither will any difference of prepositions suffice rightly to distinguish how He was conceived by the Spirit, how by the Virgin.—There remains then no other way to determine the action of the Holy Ghost but by that concurrence of the Virgin which must be acknowledged with it. For she being truly the mother of Christ, there is no reason to deny her in respect to Him whatsoever is given to other mothers in relation to the fruit of their womb: consequently no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit than what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother. When the Scripture speaks of *regeneration*, it denies all that belongs to *natural* procreation, describing the "sons of God" as "begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" John i. 13. And in the Incarnation of our Saviour we remove all will or lust of the flesh, deny all will of man concurring; but as the "bloods" according to the Hebrews signified that substance of which the flesh was formed in the womb, we acknowledge in the generation of Jesus Christ that He was made of the substance of His mother.—2. But, (*a*) He was *not* made of the *substance* of the Holy Ghost, whose essence *cannot* be *made*. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget Him by any communication of His essence, He is not the Father of Him, though He [Christ] were conceived by Him. The phrases "Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." [used sometimes by Pearson,] "The Spirit generates the Son," (as the ancients speak,) must

---

Why may *not* phrases seeming to attribute the *generation* of Christ to the Holy Ghost be understood of *proper* generation? What strange conjunction in Christ's nature has been invented by the Socinians? and with what view?

not therefore be understood of *proper* generation, auch as is the foundation of Paternity.—(*b*) Nor did the Holy Ghost form any part of Christ's flesh of any other substance than of the Virgin. For according to the flesh He was of the Fathers, truly and totally the son of David and of Abraham. The Socinians, who will not acknowledge Christ the only-begotten Son of God, have invented a strange conjunction in His nature, one part received from the Virgin, and consequently from David and from Abraham, by which He was the son of man, another conjoined with it, framed by the Spirit, by which He was the Son of God.

Practical uses of Belief in the Conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost.

216. This belief is necessary: (*a*) To prevent all suspicion of sin in Jesus. Whatsoever our original corruption is, however displeasing to God, we may be hence assured there was none in Him..... "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Job xiv. 4 .....He whose name is holiness, whose office is to sanctify, the Holy Ghost. Our Jesus was like us in all things, as born of a woman, sin only excepted, as "conceived by the Holy Ghost;" the only way by which we may be assured of that sanctification of our human nature in the person of our Saviour which was so necessary, i. To fit it for the personal union with the Word; who of His infinite love humbling Himself to become *flesh*, yet could *not*, of His infinite purity, become *sinful flesh*.—ii. To accomplish the redemption of mankind; that as the first Adam was the fountain of our impurity, the second should be of our righteousness. "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh;" Rom. viii. 3. which He could not have condemned had He been sent in *sinful* flesh. "The Father made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him;" 2 Cor. v. 21..... Whosoever is sinful needeth a Redeemer; He could have redeemed none who needed redemption Himself.

---

216. What are the practical uses of belief in the *Conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost?* Quote requisite texts throughout. (*a*) Why was the original holiness of our human nature in the person of our Saviour

.....See 1 Pet. i. 19. Heb. vii. 26. 1 John iii. 5.—(*b*) To recognise thus the freedom of the grace of God. For as the Holy Ghost is God, so is He also the *gift* of God: and therefore the human nature in its first original, without precedent merit, was by the Spirit formed, sanctified, united to the Word, so that the grace was co-existent .....with it. The mystery of the Incarnation is frequently attributed in Scripture to the love of God; "Through the tender mercy of our God the day-spring from on high hath visited us;" Luke i. 78. In this "the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared;" Tit. iii. 4. And though such Scriptures speak *properly* of the love of God to man in the Incarnation of *our Saviour*, and so *directly* exclude the merits of *other men only*, yet because they speak so *generally* of God's mercy, they may well be thought to exclude *all merit universally*. Especially considering the impossibility of merit in Christ's humanity in respect of His conception; .....He *was not man* before He was conceived, *nor* can *that merit* which *is* [exists] *not*.—(*c*) To learn from what fountain our commanded holiness must flow. We bring no such purity into the world, nor are sanctified in the womb: but as *He* was *sanctified* at His *conception*, so are *we* at our *regeneration*. He was conceived not by man but by the Holy Ghost; and we are "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" John i. 13. The same overshadowing power which *formed His* human nature, *reformeth ours*, &c.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. III. §§. 1, 2.

217. I assent to this as a most certain truth, 1. that the only-begotten Son of God, begotten by the Father before all worlds, very God of very God, was conceived and born, and so made man, assuming the human nature, consisting of a soul and body, and conjoining it with the Divine in the Unity of His Person: that the Word was in this manner made flesh, that He was really and truly conceived in the womb of a woman, 2. but not.....by the

---

so necessary? (*b*) In what particular respect with reference to the subject under consideration may the love of God shewn in the Incarnation of Christ be regarded? 217. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in *Jesus Christ as conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

common way of human propagation, but by the singular, powerful, invisible, immediate, operation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a Virgin was beyond the law of nature enabled to conceive, and that which was conceived in her was originally and completely sanctified. Thus I believe in *Jesus Christ*, WHICH WAS CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY GHOST.

ART. III. §. 3. BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

218. The Person here considered is represented under a threefold description:

219. I. Of her *Name*. The Evangelist notices that the name of the Virgin espoused, &c. "was *Mary*;" Luke i. 27. not for any peculiar excellency in the name itself, nor any particular application to the Virgin from its origination, but only to denote that singular person, then so well known to all men, being espoused to Joseph;..... "Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary?" Matt. xiii. 55. The name was then common to many; *e. g.* to the sister of Lazarus, John xi. 1., to Mary Magdalene, to the mother of James and Joses, Matt. xxvii. 56. &c. It was the same with *Miriam*, the first of which name recorded was the sister of Moses and Aaron, a prophetess;....."I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, saith the Lord,.....and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and *Miriam*;" Mic. vi. 4. As *she* then was exalted to be one of them who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage, so was *this Mary* to become the mother of that Saviour who.....hath wrought

---

218, 219, 220, 229. In what three principal respects is our Saviour's mother to be considered? 219. Was hers a common name among the Jews of her time? Give examples. With what name in the Old Testament is it identical? Who first bore that name? and what may be observed of her in reference to the bringing of the Israelites out of

a redemption for us of which that was but a type.....Beside this name of the blessed Virgin little hath been discovered to us. Christ, who commendeth the centurion, &c. hath left us no encomium of His mother. The Evangelists, who have so punctually described the city, &c. of *Joseph*, make no express mention of *her* relations, only of her *cousin Elizabeth*, who was of the tribe of Levi, of the *daughters* of *Aaron;* Luke i. 36, 5. Though it be necessary to believe that He which was born of her descended from the tribe of Judah and family of David, yet hath not Scripture clearly expressed so much of her: and there is but an obscure tradition of her parents Joacim and Anna.

220. II. Of her *Condition.* As divers characters are given to several persons, by which they are distinguished from all others of the same name, *e. g.* Jacob is called Israel, Abraham the friend of God,—so is this Mary sufficiently characterized by that inseparable companion of her name, *the Virgin.* For the full explication of which it is required to shew,

221. 1. That the Messias was to be born of a Virgin according to the prophets. In refutation of the Jews, who deny this, it will be necessary to shew from the oracles committed to them that the promised Messias was to be born miraculously, to be the son of a *woman*, *not* of a *man.* i. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" Gen. iii. 15. where as *seed* is *not*..... *collectively* to be taken for the generation of *mankind*, *but*.....*individually* for that *one seed*

Egypt? Of what tribe and family *must* our Saviour's mother have sprung? Is such a descent *recorded* in Scripture? Who was her cousin Elizabeth? 220. How is the mother of Jesus distinguished from others of the same name? 221. Shew from predictions in the Old

which is *Christ*, so *the woman* is *not* to be understood with relation to *man*, *but particularly* to *that sex* from which *alone immediately* that seed should come.—ii. According with this promise is the prediction, "The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth; a woman shall compass a man;" Jer. xxxi. 22. That new creation of a man is therefore *new*, therefore a *creation*, because wrought in a woman only, without a man, compassing a man. Which interpretation is *ancient*, literal, and clear. And when [later] Jews would force the phrase of "compassing a man" to anything *else* than a *conception*, they also contradict the preceding part of the promise, making the new creation *neither new*, as common, *nor* a *creation*, as easy.—iii. But if this prophecy of Jeremiah seem obscure, it will be cleared by that of Isaiah vii. 14. "Behold, a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His name Emmanuel." On the promulgation of the Gospel the Jews gave three answers to this text; *α.* denying that it spake of a *Virgin*; *β.* asserting that it could not belong to *Jesus*; *γ.* affirming that it was fully completed in *Hezekiah*. Whereas the original word was translated a *Virgin* by *Jewish* interpreters some hundred years before Christ's birth. And besides the notation of the word and its Scripture usage, the *wonder* of the *sign* given by the Lord Himself would prove it. And most manifestly the prediction was not fulfilled in Hezekiah. For Ahaz, in whose reign it was delivered, reigned but *sixteen* years, 2 Kings xvi. 2. and Hezekiah, his son and successor, was *twenty-five* years old when he

---

Testament that the Messias was to be born of a Virgin. Shew the futility of Jewish objections to this application of a prophecy which is to this purpose in Jeremiah, and of another still more express in Isaiah.

began to reign, xviii. 2. consequently was already born several years before this sign was given. The Jews then naming *him only* to *fulfil* the prophecy in whom it *could not* have been *fulfilled*, confirm our faith, for they plainly shew that they knew not of any fulfilment of it till our Saviour came, therefore cannot reasonably deny that it belonged to the Messias; as divers of the ancient Rabbin acknowledged.

222. 2. That Mary, the mother of Jesus, was a Virgin when she bare Him, when she "brought forth her first-born son." She was a Virgin when and after she was espoused to Joseph; "the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a Virgin espoused, &c." Luke i. 27. She was so also after the angel's salutation;—she asks, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Also after her conception by the Holy Ghost; for when she was "espoused unto Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost;" Matt. i. 18. Also even when she had brought forth; according to St Matthew's application of the prophecy, ".....a *Virgin* shall be with child, and shall *bring forth* a Son;" i. 23.

223. 3. That she ever *continued* a Virgin; according to the tradition of the fathers, and the constant doctrine of the Church. Though it be sufficient as to the mystery of the Incarnation that when our Saviour was conceived and born, His mother was a Virgin,.. though the Creed has only "*born* of the *Virgin* Mary," yet the peculiar eminency of that mother, the special reverence due to that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, the singular piety of Joseph, have persuaded the Church of God in all ages to acknowledge her the *ever* Virgin Mary. As if of her were to be understood, "This gate shall be shut, &c. and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord God of Israel

---

222. Shew that our Saviour's mother was a Virgin even when she had brought forth. 223. What reasons have persuaded the Church to believe that she ever continued so?

hath entered in by it: &c." Ezek. xliv. 2.—Many indeed have denied this, because not recorded in Scripture; nay have asserted, but unsuccessfully, the contrary to be there delivered.

224. (*a*) From St Matthew's testimony, "Joseph knew not Mary *until* she had brought forth her first-born son;" i. 25. they would infer that *afterwards* he knew her. But *the negation antecedling* "until" is *no affirmation following* it: *e. g.* when God said to Jacob, "I will not leave thee until I have done that....." Gen. xxviii. 15. it follows not that when that was done, He left him. See similar instances, "No man knoweth of his [Moses'] sepulchre unto this day;" Deut. xxxiv. 6. "Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death;" 1 Sam. xv. 35. "Michal.....had no child unto the day of her death;" 2 Sam. vi. 23. Christ promised His presence to the Apostles, "unto the end of the world;" Matt. xxviii. 20.

225. (*b*) From Christ's being termed the *first-born son* of *Mary* they infer she must have a second: but might as well conclude that wherever there *is one* there *must be two*. For in this particular the Scripture notion of priority *excludes* an *antecedent*, but *infers not* a *consequent*. "Sanctify unto Me," saith God, "all the first-born;" a fixed law, obliging *immediately* on the birth; ....."whatsoever openeth the womb" (this determines the first-born)....."it is Mine;" Exod. xiii. 2. "Those that are to be redeemed from a month old shalt thou redeem;" Numb. xviii. 16. not expecting another birth to perfect the redemption. Since then "they brought" our Saviour "to Jerusalem to present Him to the Lord, as it is written in the Law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord," Luke ii. 22, 23. it is evident that He was called the *first-born* of Mary in the sense of the Law of Moses; and consequently that title proves not the mother to have any other offspring.

226. (*c*) They object that we undeniably read in Scripture of the *brethren* of our Lord: "He went down to Capernaum, He, and His mother, and His brethren;" John ii.

---

224. Shew that the objection to this belief drawn from St Matthew's expression that "Joseph knew not Mary *until* she had brought forth, &c." has no weight. Quote texts in illustration. 225. Shew the same as to the objection from the expression, "the *first-born* son of Mary; quoting requiste texts. 226. Shew the same as to the

12. "While He talked unto the people, His mother and His brethren stood without, &c." Matt. xii. 46. But these His brethren.....are never called the *sons of His mother*.....Joseph might possibly have children before Mary was espoused to him; and then as he was *reputed* and *called* our Saviour's *father*, they might be *accounted* and *called* His *brethren*: So the ancient, especially the Greek, fathers. But we need not assert that Joseph had any offspring: the language of the Jews includes in the name of *brethren* the larger relation of *consanguinity*. "We be *brethren*." Gen. xiii. 8. said Abraham to Lot, who was, as elsewhere properly styled, "the son of his brother;" xii. 5. Moses (Lev. x. 4.) directed Mishael and Elzaphan, the *sons* of *Uzziel* the *uncle* of *Aaron*, to carry from before the sanctuary their *brethren* Nadab and Abihu, the *sons* of *Aaron*. "Jacob told Rachel that he was her father's *brother*," Gen. xxix. 12. whereas he was his *nephew*.—The *kindred* of the blessed Virgin might then be called the *brethren* and *sisters* of her only Son; .....Somewhat the later, but the most generally approved answer.

227. (*d*) But they have urged the objection yet further, pretending that Scripture shewed these *brethren* of Christ to be the *sons* of *Mary His mother*....." Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?" Matt. xiii. 55. Therefore James and Joses were doubtless Christ's brethren: and doubtless also the *sons* of *Mary*: for among the women at the cross we find "Mary Magdalene and *Mary the mother of James and Joses*;" Matt. xxvii. 56 And *this Mary* they think must be our *Lord's mother*, because they find her early in the morning at the sepulchre with Mary Magdalene and Salome, and it is not probable that any should have more care of the son's body than the mother.....But now if it appear that *Mary the mother of James and Joses* was *different* from *Mary* the *Virgin*, it will also be apparent that our Lord's *brethren* for James and Joses were so called—*were* the *sons* of *another mother*.

---

objection from the mention in Scripture of the *brethren* of our Lord; noticing two modes of accounting for their being so called, though *not sons of His mother*. 227. In answer to the last objection, as still further urged, that Scripture shews *James* and *Joses* the *brethren* of Christ, to be *also sons of Mary His mother*, shew moreover that they *were* actually *sons* of *another Mary*. Quote the necessary texts.

Now we read in St John that "there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and His *mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas,* and Mary Magdalene;" John xix. 25. and in the rest of the Evangelists we find at the same place "Mary Magdalene;" and "*Mary the mother of James and Joses;*" Matt. xxvii. 56. Mark xv. 40. and again at the sepulchre, "Mary Magdalene and the *other Mary;*" Matt. xxviii. 1. from all which this *other Mary* appears to be *Mary the wife of Cleophas* and *the mother of James* and *Joses;* and consequently *James* and *Joses,* our Lord's *brethren,* were so called, according to Jewish usage, as being the *sons* of that *other Mary,* His *mother's sister.*

228. *Conclusion.* There can be nothing found to raise the least suspicion of any interruption of the ever-blessed Mary's perpetual virginity. For as she was a Virgin when she conceived, and after she brought forth, our Saviour, so she continued, and was commended by Him to His beloved disciple, as a mother only now of an adopted Son.

229. III. Of her *Action;* of what is to be attributed to *her* in this sacred Nativity. We must again remember here the most ancient, and brief, form of this Art. [*see par.* 203.] When afterward the *conception* was attributed to the *Spirit,* the *nativity* to the *Virgin,* it was *not* to be understood as if the *Spirit* had *conceived* Him, *but* the blessed *Virgin by* the operation of the *Spirit.* She was the Mother of our Saviour: by 1. *Conception;* by which she conceived of her own substance the real substance of our Saviour. "A Virgin shall conceive;" Isai. vii. 14. "Thou shalt conceive in thy womb," Luke i. 31. He is termed "the fruit of her womb," ver. 42. by Elizabeth.—2. *Nutrition* of our Saviour's body, once conceived, by the true substance of her own; by which "she was found

---

228. How does our Saviour's mode of commending His mother, at His crucifixion, to the care of His beloved disciple favour the notion of her uninterrupted Virginity?
229. What is to be attributed to the Virgin in the Birth of Christ? By what three things is she His mother?

with child of the Holy Ghost," Matt. i. 18., is described as....."great with child," Luke ii. 5., and thus pronounced happy....." Blessed is the womb that bare (βαστάσασα) Thee" [Jesus]. xi. 27. —3. *Parturition;* whereby Christ was properly born by a true nativity. As we read, "Elizabeth's full time came that she should be delivered, and she brought forth a son," Luke i. 57. so is it said of *Mary*, "The days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born Son;" ii. 6, 7.—We must therefore [from 1, 2, 3.] acknowledge the blessed Virgin truly and properly the Mother of our Saviour. And so is she frequently styled the mother of Jesus by the Evangelists, by Elizabeth particularly the "Mother of her Lord;" Luke i. 43. as also by the general consent of the Church (because He which was born of her was God) the *Deipara*, which being a compound title begun in the Greek Church. (Θεοτόκος) was resolved into its parts by the Latins, and so the Virgin named the Mother of God.

Practical uses of belief in Jesus Christ as Born of the Virgin Mary.

230. This belief is necessary: (*a*) In respect of *her;* that we might perpetually preserve an esteem of her person proportionable to so high a dignity and incommunicable privilege. "From henceforth" said she "all generations shall call me blessed; Luke i. 48, Even when Christ was but newly conceived in her womb Elizabeth hailed her as "blessed among women;" ver. 42.....We cannot bear too reverent a regard unto the mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not the worship due unto Him. In the

---

Quote texts. What remarkable epithets have been applied to her in this character by the Greeks and Latins? 230. What are the practical uses of belief in Jesus Christ as *born of the Virgin Mary?* Quote texts throughout. (*a*) How did the primitive Church distinguish between what

language of the primitive Church, Let her be honoured and esteemed, let Him be worshipped and adored.—(*b*) In respect of *Him;* i. That we might be sure He was "made of a woman," and consequently had from her the true nature of man. Fallen man had been condemned like the fallen "angels, whose nature He took not on Him," but that "He took on Him the seed of Abraham." We, "partakers of flesh and blood," could expect no redemption but by Him who "took part of the same;" Heb. ii. 14. There being but *one Mediator* between God and man, the *man* Christ Jesus, we must needs be assured that our Jesus was a *man*. He, a *man*, was born of a *woman*, that He might redeem both *men and women*, &c. —ii. That we might be assured that He, though like us in all things, was yet, "*without sin;*" Heb. iv. 15. The Paschal Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world must be without blemish. See 1 Cor. v. 7. John i 29. Exod. xii. 5. Whereas then *we* draw contamination by our seminal traduction from the first Adam, *He* hath received the same nature without any culpable inclination, because born without such traduction, of a pure Virgin. Our High Priest is "separate from sinners," not only in His actions but in the production of His nature. For as Levi was in the loins of Abraham, and paid tithes in Him, and yet Christ, though the son of Abraham, *paid* them *not* in him, but *received* them in Melchizedech, so we being in the loins of Adam may be said to sin in him, yet Christ, descended according to the flesh from Adam, was *not* a *partaker* of that sin, but an *expiation* for it. For he which is contained in the seminal virtue of his parent is some way under his natural power, and therefore may be some way concerned in his actions: not so he who is only from him by passive power, and so receiveth not his propagation from him, &c.—iii. That we might be assured that He was of the family of David, as born of the Virgin Mary who descended from him, and was espoused to Joseph who descended from the same, that thereby His genealogy might be known. We must believe that our Saviour "was made of the seed of *David* according to the flesh:" for whatsoever promises were made to the Messias were appropriated to *him*.

---

was due to the Virgin and to her Son? (*b*) Levi in the loins of Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedech; Christ, though Abraham's son, paid them not in him, but received

The "seed of the woman," contracted to the seed of *Abraham*, was next appropriated to the *son of David*; "God had sworn.....to him that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh He would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;" Acts ii. 30. --See Luke i. 32. 69. Matt. ix. 27. xv. 22. &c.—[*See par.* 120. (*a*) (*b*); *where other texts here quoted by Pearson are also given.*]

Summary of Truths Confessed in Art. III. §. 3.

231. I assent to this as a most certain truth, That there was a woman named Mary, espoused to Joseph of Nazareth, who before and after her espousals was a pure Virgin, and continuing in the same Virginity did by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost conceive within her womb the only-begotten Son of God, and after the natural time of other women brought Him forth as her first-born Son, continuing still a most pure Virgin; whereby the Saviour of the world was born of a woman under the Law, without the least pretence of original corruption, that He might deliver us from the guilt of sin; born of that Virgin of the house and lineage of David, that He might sit on *his* throne, and reign for ever. Thus I believe in Jesus Christ BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

ART. IV. Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was Crucified, Dead, and Buried.

232. The most ancient Creeds had here only "under Pontius Pilate was crucified and buried;" comprehending His *whole* passion and His *death* in His *crucifixion*....But since He *suffered not only* on the *cross*, though there chiefly, and since He *might* have been *affixed to it*, yet *not* have *died*, the Church thought fit to add the *rest* of His *sufferings* as *antecedent*, and His *death* as *consequent*, to His *crucifixion*.

---

them in Melchizedech: What contrast does Pearson hence illustrate? 231. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in Jesus Christ as *born of the Virgin Mary*. 232. How did the most ancient Creeds express the IVth Article? What addition, and why? did the Church afterwards make to this statement?

§. 1. SUFFERED.

233. For the explication of our Saviour's *passion* (as distinct from the following particulars in the Art.) shall be shewn,

234. I. *Who* suffered: whom we must consider,

235. 1. In His *Office*: in respect of which we believe that He which was the *Christ* did suffer; and so profess to be saved by faith in a *suffering Messias*. Of which to give a just account,

236. *a*) We must prove that the *promised Messias* was to *suffer*. This unquestionable to *Christians*: our Saviour constantly told His Apostles so both before and after His death; See Mark ix. 12. Luke xxiv. 26, 46. St Paul alleged "that the Christ must needs have suffered;" Acts xvii. 3.

237. But since these testimonies will only satisfy *believers*, and our Saviour Himself referred the *unbelieving Jews* to the Law and the Prophets, as testifying of Him, we will shew from the *oracles committed* to the *Jews*, "how it was written of the Son of man, that He must suffer many things;" Mark ix. 12. and "how the Spirit of Christ which was in the Prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ;" 1 Pet. i. 11. The 53rd chapter of Isaiah is unquestionably a description of a *suffering* person: "a man of sorrows..... oppressed and afflicted, &c. &c. cut off out of the land of the living." But the person there treated of was certainly the Messias, as is confessed

---

223. 234. 244. 246. "Suffered." What is required for the explication of this expression? 233. "Suffered." What is here *distinctly* considered? 234. 235, 243. In what two principal respects are we to consider Him who suffered? 236. Shew that the promised Messias was to suffer, from our Saviour's own, and from Apostolical testimony. 237. Shew the same, especially as in opposition to unbelieving Jews, from a remarkable prophecy in Isaiah.

by the most ancient Jews, and manifest from the place itself. For no man's "soul" can be "made an offering for" our "sins," but our Saviour's; on no other man hath God "laid the iniquity of us all;" on no other could "the chastisement of our peace" be; "with" no "stripes" but "His" could "we" be "healed."……It was *He* who "bore our griefs, and carried our sorrows."

238. This prediction is so clear, ever since the "serpent" was to "bruise the heel of the woman's seed," that the Jews, resolved to expect a Messias *only glorious*, have invented *another* to *suffer*; *one*, the Son of *David*, of the tribe of *Judah*, they say, is to *redeem* us, and *reign for ever:* the *other*, the Son of *Joseph*, of the tribe of *Ephraim*, to *suffer* for us. [*see par.* 120. (*a*)] Consequently, according to *them*, Jesus, acknowledged by us a *suffering Messias*, is *not a Saviour*, and our confession of Him *both* to be the *Son* of *David*, and *also* to have *died*, is *contradictory*.

239. But this distinction of a double Messias is i. In itself *false*, therefore of *no force against us*. The Scriptures never mention any Messias of the tribe of *Ephraim*, or as a son of *Joseph*. As we acknowledge *but one Mediator*, so the Scriptures mention *but one Messias*. Whether as "the seed of the woman" or "of Abraham," as "Shiloh" or "the son of David," there is *but one* Person promised: and the style of the ancient Jews before our Saviour's coming was "He" (*not they*) "which is to come." The question asked Him when He professed Himself to be Christ, was whether it was *He* which "was to come," or whether they were to

---

238. What distinction have they invented to elude the Christian application of this prophecy? 239. Shew that this distinction is both false in itself, and invented to counterfeit the truth; not only invalid against us, but advantageous to us.

"look for another?" Matt. xi. 3.—*not* that they could look for *Him, and* for *another also.* The objection *then* was that Elias was *not yet come,* and that till *he* came they expected no Messias. Nor does the difference of the Messiah's condition give reason to imagine a double person; for in the same place the prophets speaking of the same person represent Him in either condition. See Zech. ix. 9. Isai. ix. 6.—ii. First invented to *counterfeit* the *truth,* and so actually *advantageous to us*.....Why should they pretend to expect *one* to *die* and *another* to *triumph,* but that the *true* Messias was confessedly *both* to *triumph* and to *die,* to be *humbled* and to be *exalted?* &c. Why tell us of *one* Mediator to be *conquered,* the *other* to be *victorious,* but that the *serpent* was to *bruise* the *heel* of the *seed of the woman,* and the *same* seed to *bruise his head?*

240. (*b*) We must shew that *Jesus,* whom we believe to be Christ, *suffered.* But we need not prove this, which is confessed by all.....If hunger and thirst, revilings and contempt, sorrows and agonies, stripes and buffetings, condemnation and crucifixion, be sufferings,—if the infirmities of our nature, the weight of our sins, the malice of man, the machinations of Satan, the hand of God, could make Him suffer,—if the annals of the times, the writings of His Apostles, the confession of the Gentiles, the scoffs of the Jews, be testimonies,—Jesus suffered. None ever thought He did not really suffer who did not also pretend (as the Docetæ) that He was not really man.

---

240. Shew that Jesus (our Messias) suffered: making reference to some particulars of His sufferings, and to testimonies which prove the reality of His sufferings acknowledged by all: (with the exception of what ancient heretics only?)

241. (*c*) We shall shew i. That the sufferings of the Messias, for us were *agreed on* betwixt Him and the Father. "Against Thy Holy child Jesus, whom Thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, &c. were gathered together, for to do whatsoever Thy *hand* and Thy *counsel determined before* to be done;" Acts iv. 27, 28. For as when the two goats were presented before the Lord, Lev. xvi. 8. the lot of the Lord, which decided which goat was to be offered for a sin offering, was lift up in the *hand* of the high-priest, &c. so the *hand* of God is said to have *determined* what should be done to our Saviour, whose passion was typified by that sin-offering... He was "delivered by the *determinate counsel* and foreknowledge of God;" Acts ii. 23.—ii. That this *determination* was made on a *covenant* (made from eternity) between the Father and the Son, in which it was concluded by both what the Son should suffer, what receive. This covenant (*another* besides that made *between God and man*, confirmed by Christ's blood,) is expressed, partly by the propounded condition, "If He shall make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, &c." Isai. liii. 10. partly by the acceptation of it, "Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do Thy will, O God;" Psal. xl. 7. Heb. x. 7.—iii. That these *agreed on* and *determined* sufferings of the Messias were *Divinely revealed* to the Prophets, and delivered to the Church, involved in types and acted in sacrifices. St Paul well asserted that he "said none other things but those which the prophets and Moses did say should come, that Christ should

---

241. Shew from Scripture that the sufferings of the Messias were agreed on between Him and the Father, determined according to covenant between them, and revealed to the prophets who delivered them to the Church. How did Moses *say* that Christ should suffer? Mention some remarkable instances.

suffer;" Acts xxvi. 22. The prophets *said* so in express terms; Moses *said* so in the ceremonies he instituted by his ministry. When he caused the Passover to be slain he *said* that Shiloh was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world; when he set the brazen serpent up in the wilderness, he *said* the Son of Man should be lifted up upon the cross; when he commanded the sacrifices for sin, he *said* without blood-shedding there was no remission, and therefore the Son of God must die for the sins of men; when he appointed Aaron to go into the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement, he *said* that Christ, our High-Priest, should never enter the highest heavens to expiate for us but by His own blood.

242. (*d*) We shall then shew that these *agreed on*, *determined*, and *revealed* sufferings of the *true Messias* were most fully undergone by *Jesus* of Nazareth. On the approach of His death, He said to His Apostles,....."All things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished;" Luke xviii. 31. When he delivered to them the blessed sacrament, He said, "Truly the Son of man goeth as it was determined;" Luke xxii. 22. After His resurrection, He rebuked the two disciples....."O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! ought not Christ to have suffered these things, &c." Luke xxiv. 25, 26. And after His Ascension St Peter professed before the Jews, who had those prophecies, and saw His sufferings, "Those things which God before had shewed by the mouth of all His prophets, that Christ should suffer, He hath so fulfilled;" Acts iii. 18.

---

242. Quote declarations of our Saviour as to the fulfilment in Him of all those agreed on, &c. sufferings: and a similar declaration of St Peter.

243. 2. In His *Person.* By the immediate coherence of this and the preceding Articles.....it plainly appears that the Person named "Jesus" and described as "the only Son" of God "suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried."....."The princes of this world crucified the Lord of glory;" 1 Cor. ii. 8. and "God purchased His Church with His own blood;" Acts xx. 28. That Person which (as already proved) was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the *Lord of glory* and most truly *God*, took on Him the nature of man, and in *that* nature, being still the *same Person* He was before, did suffer. When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was *no other person* hungry than that Son of God which made the world; when He sat down weary by the well, when He was buffeted and scourged, there was *no other person* thirsty, &c.....when He was crucified and died, there was *no other person* which gave up the ghost but the Son of Him, and so of the same nature with Him, "who only hath immortality;" 1 Tim. vi. 16. The *Person* who suffered was *God the Son.*

244. II. *How*, or *in what*, He suffered.....The Divine nature is of *infinite* and *eternal happiness*, *never* to be disturbed by the *least* degree of infelicity. Wherefore while we profess that the Son of God suffered for us, we must *deny* that the *Divine* nature of our Saviour suffered. For since the Divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if *that* had been

---

243. Shew that the *Person* who, in His office of Messias, *suffered*, was no other than *God the Son.* 244. Why could not Christ possibly suffer in His Divine nature? In what nature alone did He suffer? What heretics held opinions inconsistent with the Catholic truth as to this subject?

the subject of His passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffered. Wherefore, as we ascribe the passion to the *Son alone*, so must we attribute it to *that nature* which is *His alone*, i.e. the *human*.....The Son alone is *man*, and *so* capable of suffering.——....."Christ suffered for us in the flesh," 1 Pet. iv. 1. in that nature of man which He, the eternal Word, took upon Him ;... see 1 Pet. iii. 18. Rom. i. 3, 4...Thus the proper subject of our Saviour's passion, undergone for us, was that nature which He took from us.——.....

We must not conceive the Divine nature capable of any diminution, must not imagine the essence of the Word subject to the sufferings of the flesh He took, nor yet harbour so groundless an estimation of the Incarnation as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with the other. These wild collections of the Arian* and Apollinarian heretics the church hath long silenced with the sound assertion that all the sufferings of our Saviour were subjected in His human nature.

245. And now, how can we reconcile the Person suffering with the subject of His passion ; how say *God* did *suffer* when we profess the *Godhead suffered not ?* The solution is easy, if we consider the intimate *conjunction* of the *Divine* and *human* natures, and their *union* in the *Person* of the Son ; whereby the attributes which properly belong to the one, are given to the other ; and with good reason. For...since by reason of the Incarnation, by which the *same* individual *Person* is *both God* and *man*, it is proper to say *God is man*, it follows that whatsoever necessarily belongs to the human nature may be spoken of God ; or there would be a man to whom the nature of man does not belong : a contradiction. And since by virtue

---

245. In consideration of what do we properly say, "God did suffer," though we profess that the Godhead suffered

* The heresy of Arius as condemned in the Nicene Council is well known ; but that he made the *nature* of the *Word* to suffer in the flesh is not so frequently or plainly delivered. Pearson quotes authorities.

of the same incarnation it is also proper to say, *a man is God*, it follows that all the essential attributes of the Divine nature may be spoken of that man; or there would be one truly God to whom the nature of God did not belong: a contradiction. Again, if the *properties* of the *Divine* nature may be truly attributed to that *man* which is *God*, so also may the *actions* flowing from those properties. And since the *properties* of the *human* nature may be also attributed to the eternal *Son of God*, so also may the *actions* or *passions* proceeding from them. Wherefore as *God the Son* is truly *man*, and *as man* truly *passible* and *mortal*, so God the Son did truly suffer and die. And this is the only true "communication of properties."* Not that the essential properties of one nature are communicated to the other nature:.....Although the human nature was conjoined to the Divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone, and the Divine as little suffered as if it had not been conjoined: because each kept their respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction.—Thus God the Son suffered, though not in His Deity, by reason of which He is truly God, yet in His *humanity*, by which *He* who is truly *God* is as truly *man*.

---

not? Shew that the properties, and consequently the actions and passions, of the *human* nature may be attributed to the *Son of God*. What is properly meant by the "communication of properties," as not involving a *confusion* of the properties of the Divine and human natures? State briefly, in conclusion from the arguments previously used, *how* God the Son suffered.

* In the language of the Schools, "Communicatio idiomatum:" in that of the ancient Greek Divines, Ἀντίδοσις and Ἀντιμετάστασις.

246. III. *What* He suffered: as far as is comprehended in this Article, which *excludes* the *antecedent* part of His sufferings by the expression, "under Pontius Pilate," not governor of Judæa long before our Saviour's baptism; and His *concluding* passion, by adding His crucifixion and death. Looking then on His sufferings in the time of His preaching the gospel, and especially before His death, we shall consider them in relation to the *subject* of them, His human nature, which consisting of two parts, the soul and body, it will be necessary to declare,

247. 1. What He suffered in the *body*. His body, really and truly *human*, was also frail and mortal, ...and though now the same body by its glorification be put beyond possibility of passion, yet in the time of His humiliation it was clothed with no such glorious perfections.—(*a*) It was liable to *internal weakness* and *natural infirmities*...As it was subject to, so it felt, weariness, hunger, &c. —(*b*) It was liable also to all *outward injuries* and *violent impressions*. As all our corporal pain consists in that sense which arises from a solution of the continuity connatural to the parts of our body, so was He truly and fully sensible of the pain arising from the violation of any part of His sacred body by any outward impression. Deep was that sense, grievous that pain, when "the ploughers ploughed upon His back, &c." Psal. cxxix. 3. The coronary thorns.....pierced His tender temples to a multiplicity of pains.....The spear.....which opened His side.....caused no

---

246. [*See* 233.] How does the language of this Article limit the *beginning* of the period of our Saviour's sufferings considered in this section? Under what two principal heads are we to consider the sufferings undergone by our Saviour in His human nature? 247. What did He suffer in His body?

dolorous sensation, because the body was then dead; but the nails which pierced His hands and feet made another kind of impression while it was yet alive and highly sensible.

248. 2. What He suffered in the *soul*. In whatever sense the soul is capable of suffering, in that He was subject to animal passion.—(*a*) Evil apprehended *to come* tormented His soul with *fear*, as truly in Him in respect of what He was to suffer as *hope* in reference to the reward consequent on His sufferings.—(*b*) Evil apprehended as *present* tormented His soul with *sadness and anguish*. So was He truly "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief;" Isai. liii. 3. and the proper subject (or recipient) of that grief He who alone felt it hath fully expressed, "My *soul* is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death;" Matt. xxvi. 38.——How bitter that grief, how great that sorrow, which He felt in His soul, we can never fully measure; yet we may infallibly know, both i. from the expressions of the Spirit of God, and ii. from the occasion of His sufferings, that His sorrows were most incomparably beyond all sorrows of which any person here was sensible or capable.

249. i. The Evangelists have used such language as must raise our highest admiration of the bitterness of His passion. "He began to be sorrowful," (λυπεῖσθαι) saith St Matthew; xxvi. 37. "He began to be sore amazed," (ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι) saith St Mark; xiv. 33. "and to be very heavy," (ἀδημονεῖν) say both: and yet our translation falls far short of their original expressions, which render Him suddenly possessed with horror and amazement, encompassed with grief and overwhelmed with

---

248. What did He suffer in His soul? 249. How is the *intensity* of our Saviour's sufferings testified by the *language* of the sacred writers?

sorrow, pressed down with consternation and dejection of mind, tormented with anxiety and disquietude of spirit.—"My soul," said He to His disciples "is exceeding sorrowful;" adding, "even unto death;" as if the pangs of death had already encompassed Him.....He went but a little further before He expressed the same to His Father, falling on His face, and praying "with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death;" Heb. v. 7. Yet more: the innumerable pores of His body must give a passage to the more lively representations of the bitter anguish of His soul; and while He prayed more earnestly, "His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground;" Luke xxii. 44. As the Psalmist had declared, "I am poured out like water,... my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels;" xxii. 14...

250. ii. The occasion of His grief will manifest the bitterness of it. God "laid on Him the iniquities of us all:" and as we are obliged to be sorry for our particular sins, so was He grieved for the sins of us all. If then we look on the perfection of His knowledge, His understanding all the sins of men, all the guilt...offence...ingratitude ..contained in them, His absolute conformity to the will of God, love of Him, and zeal for His glory, His exceeding love for the sons of men, His knowledge that their sins were sufficient to bring on them eternal destruction, His consideration of them whom He so loved as lying under the wrath of God whom He so truly worshipped, His own exceeding abhorrence of sin, from the infinite graces diffused through His soul,—we cannot wonder at that His sorrow. If the true contrition

---

250. How is the *intensity* of His sufferings manifest from the *occasion* of them?

of *one* sinner for *his own* iniquities, *not all known* to *himself*, cannot be performed without great bitterness of remorse, what bounds can we set to the anguish proceeding from a *full apprehension* of *all* the transgressions of *so many* sinners?—add moreover the immediate hand of God pressing on Him at once all this load of all the sorrows which can befall any of the saints of God, that He, being "touched with the feelings of our infirmities," might be a "merciful High-Priest, able" and willing "to succour them that are tempted;" Heb. ii. 17, 18. iv. 15.——Thus may we "behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto" that "sorrow which was done unto" Him. "wherewith the Lord afflicted" Him "in the day of His fierce anger;" Lam. i. 12.....

Practical uses of Belief that Our Saviour Suffered.

251. This belief is necessary: that we may be assured (*a*) Of the verity of His human nature, without which nature He could not be man, and then could not redeem man.....We know the Godhead is infinitely perfect, and therefore far above all molestation. When therefore we see Christ suffering, we acknowledge the addition of His human nature as the proper subject of His passion, and conclude our Mediator to be truly man...- (*b*) Of the redemption of lapsed men, and their reconciliation to God, which was not otherwise to be performed than by a plenary satisfaction to His will. He therefore was by all His sufferings made an expiation, atonement, and propitiation for all our sins [*See par.* 102.] (*c*) Of His having done what behoved Him, to purchase eternal happiness in heaven for Himself the Head, and the members of His body. "Ought not Christ to suffer, and so to enter into His own glory?" Luke xxiv. 26. see Psal. cx. 7. And doth He not by the same right confer that glory on us? (*d*) Of His being truly affected with a most tender compassion of our afflictions. He was

---

251. What are the practical uses of belief that our Saviour *suffered*?

most unmerciful to Himself that He might be most merciful to us.—(*e*) Necessary also, that we might learn that we are to suffer and how we are to suffer.—"If these things were done to the green tree, what shall be done to the dry?" Luke xxiii. 31. If God spared not His *natural*...Son, how shall He spare His *adopted* sons, best known to be His children because chastised?...As surely as if Christ be risen, we shall also rise, so if Christ hath suffered, we must expect to suffer.—And He alone hath also left us an absolutely perfect pattern to direct us in our sufferings; even He who hath taught us in all our afflictions the exercise of admirable humility, perfect patience, and absolute submission to the will of God.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. IV. §. 1.

252. I profess this as a most certain truth, that the only begotten Son of God did for the redemption of mankind really suffer; not in His Divinity, which was impassible, but in His humanity, which in the days of His humiliation was subject to our infirmities: that as He is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, so was He a complete sufferer in the whole; in His body by infirmities arising internally from human frailties, and by pains inflicted by external injuries; in His soul by fearful apprehensions, by unknown sorrows, by anguish inexpressible. Thus I believe our Saviour SUFFERED.

ART. IV. §. 2. UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.

253. As the Son of God by His determinate counsel was sent into the world to die in the fulness of time, so it concerns the church to be assured of the *time* in which He died; which is here declared by noting the governor under whom He suffered, namely, Pontius Pilate. And because He was also condemned by him as a judge, it is expedient for the illustration of the manner, and confirmation of the truth, of our Saviour's sufferings,

---

252. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief that our Saviour *suffered*. 253. Why has the Church thought it expedient to mention in the Creed the governor under whom our Saviour suffered? For what

to declare what can be known concerning I. His Person ; II. His Office ; [III. His Character.]

254. I. We find him described by two names ; 1. *Pontius*, (his *nomen*,) the name of his *family*, which was very ancient ; 2. *Pilatus*, (his *cognomen*,) an addition distinguishing him from the rest descending from the same original. No other name of his is extant, though according to Roman custom he should have had another, (the *prænomen*,) which would precede the two mentioned.) ——He was a Roman by birth, of the equestrian order, sent by the emperor Tiberius to be a governor of Judæa. For about threescore years before our Saviour's birth the Jews were by Pompey made tributary to the Romans, who suffered them indeed to be ruled by their own governors during the life of Hyrcanus the High-Priest, and the reign of Herod and his son Archelaus, but on Archelaus' banishment by Augustus, the Jews received their governors, of whom Pontius Pilate was the fifth, from the Roman Emperor, being made a *part* of the *province* of *Syria* belonging to his care.

255. II. The *office* of this Pilate was the *procuratorship* of Judæa ; as is evident from Roman and Jewish historians.* But *what* that office was, is not so easy to determine : because it was itself of

---

reasons is it expedient to ascertain what can be known concerning him ? 254. State particulars as to the two names by which that governor is described. Why should we suppose that he may have had another name (of what kind ?) though none such be extant ? What was his national origin, and rank ? By whom was he sent to be governor of Judæa ? When were the Jews made tributary to the Romans ? When first immediately subjected to Roman governors ? Of what Roman province was Judæa made a part ? 255. What was the office which Pontius

* Tacitus, Josephus, Philo.

recent origin, and had been still more recently introduced into Judæa. When Augustus divided the Roman provinces into two parts, assigning one to the care of the senate, and reserving the other for his own, he sent with the *President*, who was the governor-in-chief, of each province, a *Procurator*, subordinate to him, whose office was to take an account of all tribute, &c., due to the emperor, and to manage it for his advantage..... Nor at the first institution of this office had it any other jurisdiction.——But because the nation of the Jews were always suspected of a rebellious disposition against the Romans, and the *President* of *Syria*, who had the power of the sword, was forced to attend on the other parts of his province, therefore the *Procurator* of *Judæa* was furnished with power of life and death, and administered there the supreme *Presidential* power.——It was thus that by an eminent act of the providence of God it came to pass that Christ, who was to die, and yet, according to the prophets, in a manner not prescribed by the law of Moses, should be delivered up to a foreign power, and suffer death after the custom of that foreign nation.....For though the chief-priests, &c. "condemned him to be guilty of death," Mark xiv. 64. yet they could not condemn Him to die, but "delivered Him up unto Pilate," xv. 1; and when Pilate told them to take Him and judge Him according to their law, John xviii. 31. they answered, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death:".....'"not lawful," *i. e.* not in respect of the Law of Moses, which gave them power and command to punish

---

Pilate bore properly designated? When and for what purpose, originally instituted? What was the increased (why?) extent of power attached to it in Judæa? What important end was thus brought about by divine providence? Quote texts.

divers offenders with death ; but in relation to the Roman Empire, which had taken all that dominion from them on the banishment of Archelaus..... Wherefore our Saviour was delivered to Pilate as the supreme judge of the Jews, that *he* might pronounce the sentence of death upon Him.

256. III. But how this judge could be persuaded to so unjust and impious an act is not yet easy to be seen. The numerous controversies of the religion of the Jews did not concern the Roman governor.....Pilate knew it "was for envy" that the chief priests "delivered him," Matt. xxvii. 18. and repeatedly declared him to be innocent, Luke xxiii. 14, 22. His own wife, admonished in a dream, "sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man," Matt. xxvii. 19 ; and when he heard that He "made Himself the Son of God, he was the more afraid," John xix. 7, 8 ; and yet notwithstanding all this, he condemned and crucified Him.——Here we must look on the nature and disposition of Pilate. He was a man of a rough intractable spirit, as he is described by the Jews, and appears from the beginning of his government, when he brought the bucklers stamped with the pictures of Cæsar into Jerusalem, (an abomination to the Jews,) and could neither be moved by the blood of many, nor the most submissive entreaties of the whole nation, to remove them, till he received a severe reprehension and command from Tiberius. Afterwards he seized on the Corban, and spent the sacred treasure on an aqueduct, in spite of all religious and importunate petitions.....The blood of certain Galileans he mingled with their

---

256. Shew that Pilate of himself was unwilling to condemn Jesus : and account for his condemning and crucifying Him notwithstanding. Give requisite texts and illustrations.

sacrifices; Luke xiii. 1. Now add to this spirit, by which he had so much exasperated the Jews, an avaricious and rapacious disposition, which prompted him as much to please them; and we may easily perceive that "Pilate," because "*willing to content the people*,.....delivered Jesus to be crucified;" Mark xv. 15. They accused him at Rome for all his insolencies, &c., and by this act he thought to pacify them. [Dread of the Emperor's jealousy appears also to have influenced Pilate. *G. See par.* 266.]

Practical uses of Belief in our Saviour as having suffered under Pontius Pilate.

257. This belief is necessary: (*a*) That we might be assured of the *time* in which He suffered; in opposition to the enemies of Christianity who would unsettle the time of His passion, that they might at last deny His passion itself. Some falsely fixed it to the 7th year of Tiberius. See Luke iii. 1. Some of the Jews, lest the destruction of Jerusalem should seem to follow upon and for our Saviour's crucifixion, removed it near threescore years more backward yet, to the beginning of the reign of Herod; others nearly twenty years *further*, placing it under Aristobulus. This they teach their proselytes, that they may not believe even the least historical part of the Evangelists. Nor need we be ashamed of so late an original of the Christian religion: Christ came into the world *in the fulness of time*.—(*b*) That we might acknowledge a most powerful *external* testimony of the certainty of our Saviour's death, and the innocency of His life. Pontius Pilate not only professed to the condemnation of the Jews that he found nothing worthy of death in Christ, but left the same written to the Gentiles of the Roman empire; 1. by an express written

---

257. What are the practical uses of belief that Christ suffered *under Pontius Pilate?* (*a*) Mention some false dates which have been assigned (with what views?) by enemies of Christianity to our Saviour's passion. (*b*) What *written* testimonies did Pilate give to our Saviour's passion and innocence?

to Tiberius, and by him presented to the senate; 2. by records written in tables of all important transactions of his government.—(*c*) That we might understand *how* it should come to pass that Christ should suffer according to Scripture. [*See par.* 255.] The counsel of the will of God was fulfilled by the *malice* of the *Jews*, and the *customs* of the *Romans*.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. IV. §. 2.

258. I am fully persuaded of this incontrovertible truth, that in the fulness of time God sent His Son, who being so sent did suffer for the sins of men, after the fifteenth year of Tiberius the Roman emperor and before his death, in the time of Pontius Pilate, the Cæsarean Procurator of Judæa, who to please the Jews condemned Him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered Him according to the custom of that empire, and for the fulfilment of the prophecies, to die a painful and shameful death on the cross. Thus I believe in Christ who suffered UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.

ART. IV. §. 3. WAS CRUCIFIED.

259. For the explication of our Saviour's crucifixion, the most remarkable *particular* of His passion, it will be necessary

260. I. To prove that the promised Messias was to be crucified: which appears both by Types and Prophecies. Though *all* those representations and predictions which the forward zeal of some ancient fathers gathered out of the Law and the Prophets cannot be said to signify so much, yet was His crucifixion

261. 1. Represented in several Types. i. There can scarcely be a clearer type of the Saviour of the world than Isaac; nor can God the Father, who gave His only-begotten Son, be better expressed

---

258. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief that Christ suffered *under Pontius Pilate*. 259, 260, 263, 264. What is required for the application of our Saviour's crucifixion? 261. Mention some remarkable types of Christ's crucifixion; noting particulars of correspondence.

than by Abraham in his readiness to sacrifice "his only son Isaac, whom he loved;" Gen. xxii. 2. On that occasion we find Isaac walking to Mount Moriah with the wood on his shoulders, and saying, "Here is the wood; but where is the sacrifice?" himself, who bore the wood, being the sacrifice in the command of God and intention of Abraham; and thus representing Christ, the most perfect sacrifice,...who could die no other death [than crucifixion] in which the wood was to be carried, and being to die upon the cross was, according to the custom in such a case, to carry it.—ii. When the fiery serpents bit the Israelites, and "much people died," Moses by the command of God "made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole: and.....if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived;" Numb. xxi. 9. Now if there were no expresser promise of the Messias than the "seed of the woman" which should "bruise the serpent's head," if He were to perform that promise by virtue of His death, if no death could be so perfectly represented by the hanging on the pole as that of crucifixion; then was manifestly foretold what Christ informed Nicodemus, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up:" John iii. 14.—iii. The Paschal Lamb plainly typified that Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and not only the preparing of it represented the cross,* but the command of the Passover foretold as much. For by "ye shall not break a bone thereof," Exod. xii. 46., it was intimated that the Saviour of the world should suffer that death to which the breaking of the bones customarily belonged, (crucifixion,) but only should in that

* According to Justin Martyr the *manner* of the *roasting* of the Paschal Lamb represented the affixing of a man to the cross, and thereby typified Christ.

death by the providence of God be so preserved as that no bone of *His* should be broken.

262. 2. Foretold in Prophecies.....i. When God foretells by the prophet Zechariah what He should suffer from the sins of men, He says expressly, "They shall look upon Me whom they have pierced," xii. 10; shewing that He speaks of the Son of God, which was to be the Son of man, and as such subject to vulneration; and fortelling the piercing of His body; which added to ii. that prediction in the Psalms, "They pierced my hands and my feet," xxii. 17. clearly represents and foretells that death in which the hands and feet of the person crucified were affixed with nails to the cross. These prophecies so clear and so properly applied by the beloved disciple of Jesus, the Jews have therefore industriously endeavoured to elude, but in vain.

263. II. To prove that our Jesus accordingly was truly crucified. By Judas He was "betrayed to be crucified," Matt. xxvi. 2.; the Jews cried, "crucify him, crucify him," John xix. 15.; Pilate "gave sentence that it should be as they required;" Luke xxiii. 24.; the soldiers, instruments commonly used in inflicting that punishment, "led Him away to crucify Him;" Matt. xxvii. 31.; He underwent the pains which customarily preceded that punishment, flagellation, and bearing the cross, for "Pilate, when he had scourged Jesus, delivered Him to be crucified, and He bearing his cross went forth, &c." Matt. xxvii. 26. John xix 17.; they carried Him forth out of the city as was customary in such

---

262. Mention some remarkable prophecies of His crucifixion. So applied by which of the Evangelists? 263. Shew the reality of our Saviour's crucifixion by enumerating some of the leading incidents of the accounts given of it by the Evangelists. What extravagant fiction in

cases ; and there between two malefactors, usually by the Romans so punished, they "crucified Him." And when to doubting Thomas, who said "except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger, &c. I will not believe," our Saviour said, "reach hither thy finger, &c." John xx. 25, 27., He satisfied the Apostle that He was the Christ, and us that the Christ was truly crucified ; against that fond heresy (of Basilides) which made Simon the Cyrenian not only bear the cross, but endure crucifixion for our Saviour.

264. III. To shew what was the nature, what the particularities, of crucifixion. This is not now so easily to be understood as once it was : that punishment having now been so long disused. For when the Roman emperors became Christian, it was, first by Constantine the Great, forbidden, out of pious respect to the death of Christ. The original word too, (*σταυρὸς*, whence *σταυροῦν*, &c.) does not of itself declare the figure of the tree, or manner of the suffering ; so that it must be represented partly by expressions found in the Evangelical relations, partly by the language used by authors who were frequently witnesses of such executions.

265. The form of the Roman cross was a compounded figure : in which was a straight and erected piece of wood fixed in the earth, and also a transverse beam fastened to that toward the top thereof : and besides these two cutting each other transversely at right angles (so that the erect part

---

relation to Simon the Cyrenian as connected with Christ's crucifixion has been broached ? By whom ? 264. Why is it not now so easy as once it was to ascertain the exact nature, &c. of crucifixion ? By whom, and why, was it first abolished as a punishment ? 265. Give some account of the Roman cross, and of the manner in which our Saviour was affixed to it.

extended itself above the transverse), there was another piece of wood, infixed into, and standing out from, the erect one. To that erected piece was Christ's body, being lifted up, applied, as Moses' serpent to the pole, and to the transverse beam His hands were nailed : on the lower piece, projecting from the erect one, His sacred body rested, and His feet were transfixed and fastened with nails : His head, pressed with a crown of thorns, was applied to that part of the erect which stood above the transverse beam; and above His head to that was fastened the table on which was written, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the accusation, according to Roman custom ; "and the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS ;" John xix. 19.

266. We may now know on what accusation Pilate did at last pass sentence of death on Him : not of opposition to the Law of Moses, or of danger threatened to the temple, but of *sedition*, &c. The Jews* accused him as perverting the nation, &c. Luke xxiii. 2 ; and when Pilate sought to release Him, they cried out, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend, &c." John xix. 12. This moved Pilate to pass sentence on Him, and because the cross was the usual Roman punishment for that [alleged] crime, to crucify Him.

267. In this punishment are two things most observable : its (*a*) *Acerbity*.—*a*. The exquisite torments in that death are manifest, because the

---

266. What was the accusation, and how do we ascertain it to be so, on which Pilate actually condemned Jesus ?
267. Illustrate the aggravations of our Saviour's passion arising from its *acerbity*, and from its *ignominy*.

* [By the Jews' law He was to die (according to their judgment) as a blasphemer, but this they knew would have little weight with a Pagan ; therefore they brought Him before Pilate as a *state* prisoner. See note at Matt. xxvii. 2. in Valpy's Greek Test.

hands and feet, the most nervous, and consequently most sensible, parts of the body, were pierced through with nails; which caused a lingering and tormenting death. *β.* Insomuch that the Romans deduced their very expressions for pains and *cruciation* from the cross. *γ.* And those of merciful disposition would cause those adjudged to crucifixion to be previously slain.—(*b*) *Ignominy* *α.* The Romans accounted it a *servile* punishment, reckoning it a high crime to put such a dishonour on any freeman,.....*β.* and the exposure of the breathless body on the cross, after death inflicted by other torments,.....*γ.* and even such an exposure of the representations of the bodies of the dead who have been out of the reach of their enemies,.....has been thought highly opprobrious.—Thus were our Saviour's sufferings aggravated by the bitterness of *pain* in the torments of His body, and the indignity of *shame* in the interpretation of His enemies.

Practical uses of Belief in Christ Crucified.

268. This belief is necessary: (*a*) That we might be assured He hath taken *on Himself*, and consequently *from us*, the malediction of the law. We were all under the curse; "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the law, &c." Deut. xxvii. 26. Gal. iii. 10....."The Scripture hath concluded all under sin;" Gal. iii. 22.....But now "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;" ver. 13. *i. e.* hath redeemed us from that *general* curse which lay on all men for the breach of any part of the law, by taking on Him that *particular* curse laid only on them who underwent a certain punishment of the law, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree;" Deut. xxi. 23. Not that *suspension* was a capital punishment prescribed by the

---

268. What are the practical uses of belief in Christ *Crucified?* Quote texts throughout. (*a*) What *particular curse* of the Law did our Saviour take on Him by the

Law of Moses,...but that great malefactors were oftentimes, among the Jews, after death exposed to the ignominy of a gibbet; and those so hanged on a tree were accursed by the law.....The providence of God then so ordered that Christ, though not condemned to any death according to the Law of Moses, yet should suffer that death which contained in it that particularity to which the legal curse belonged, the *hanging on a tree*.....Formal *crucifixion* is often named by the general word *suspension*; and the Jews themselves commonly call our Saviour (by way of objection to Him) by that very name to which the Mosaic curse is affixed; תלוי *suspended.*)—(*b*) That we might be assured that He hath "abolished in His flesh the enmity," even "the law of commandments," Eph. ii. 15.; otherwise still wholly in force.....All the people said *Amen* to the curse on every one that kept not the whole law; Deut. xxvii. 26. "and entered into a curse..... to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses, &c." Neh. x. 29. Which was in the nature of a bond or obligation, standing in force against them, ready to bring a penalty on them in case of non-performance.....Now one ancient custom of cancelling such bonds was by striking a *nail* through the writing; and thus God by our crucified Saviour "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, &c.....nailing it to His cross;" Col. ii. 14.—(*c*) That we may testify the power of the death of Christ working in us after the manner of crucifixion. We are to be "planted in the likeness of His death;" Rom. vi. 5.....We must acknowledge and shew that "our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed:" Rom. vi. 6. must confess that "they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts;" Gal. v. 24. must not glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ whereby the world must be crucified unto us, &c., Gal. vi. 14. (*d*) That meditating on the *acerbity* of His passion, we may acknowledge the *bitterness* of His sufferings for us, and assure ourselves that by the worst of deaths He hath overcome all kinds of death; and with cheerfulness endure whatsoever He shall think fit to lay on us, who readily suffered far more for us.—(*e*) That by the

---

manner of His passion? What epithet has been applied to Him by the Jews in reference to His crucifixion? (*f*) In

ignominy of this punishment we may learn how far our Saviour descended for us, who redeemed us, slaves to sin, by a servile death, ".....took upon Him the form of a servant, &c. and became obedient unto.....the death of the cross," Phil. ii. 7, 8; teaching us humility and patience in the vilest earthly condition, and encouraging us to imitate Him, "who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame," Heb. xii. 2; and deterring us from the sin of falling from Him, lest we should "crucify to ourselves the Son of God afresh, &c." Heb. vi. 6; and so become even worse than the Jews themselves.....—(*f*) That by the public visibility of His death we might be assured that He was truly dead..... Among the heathen there were many traditions of persons *supposed* for some time to be dead,.....afterwards to live again;.....but the feigned histories of such persons, as of Pythagoras, Theseus, &c. made no *certain* mention of their *deaths*, therefore were ridiculous in the assertion of their resurrection. Whereas Christ, as He appeared to certain witnesses after His resurrection, so He died, before His enemies, visibly and conspicuously, on the cross.

Summary of Truths confessed in ART. IV. §. 3.

269. I am fully persuaded that the only-begotten Son of God, Christ Jesus, that He might cancel the handwriting which was against us, and take off the curse which was due unto us, did take on Him the form of a servant, and therein cheerfully submit Himself to the false accusation of the Jews, and the unjust sentence of Pilate, by which He was condemned, according to Roman custom, to the cross; and upon that did suffer that servile punishment of the greatest acerbity, enduring the pain; and of the greatest ignominy, despising the shame. Thus I believe in CHRIST CRUCIFIED.

---

what important particular did the case of persons who according to certain Heathen traditions died and rose again differ from that of our Saviour? 269. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in Christ *Crucified.*

ART. IV. §. 4. DEAD.

270. Though Crucifixion *of itself* involves not *certain* death,.....yet it is certain that Christ felt the full extent of that punishment...: so that as we acknowledge Him crucified, we believe Him *dead.* For the illustration of which it will be necessary

271. I. To shew that the Messias was not only to suffer, but actually to *die.* "Christ died for our sins," as St Paul declares, 1 Cor. xv. 3. "according to the Scriptures." His death was therein

272. 1. Represented by Types...i. Though Isaac, that lively type of Christ, *died not* when Abraham is said to have "offered up his only-begotten son," Heb. xi. 17., yet since "without effusion of blood there is no remission," Heb. ix. 22. without death no sacrifice for sin, since the saving of Isaac alive denies not, rather presupposes, the death of the Antitype, as presignifying his resurrection from the dead, "from whence Abraham received him in a figure," xi. 19. we may safely affirm the ancient and legal types represented a Christ which was to die.—ii. It was essential that the Paschal Lamb should be *slain;* iii. and in the sacrifices for sin which presignified a Saviour to "sanctify the people with His own blood, the bodies of the beasts were burnt without the camp, and their blood brought into the sanctuary;" Heb. xiii. 11, 12.

270, 271, 274, 279. What is required to illustrate that clause of the Creed which affirms that our Saviour was "*dead?*" 272. Mention Types representing the death of our Saviour. Shew that the saving of Isaac alive when brought to be sacrificed does not invalidate such an application in his case.

273. 2. Foretold in Prophecies. "He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter—was cut off out of the land of the living—made His soul an offering for sin;" Isai. liii. 7, 8, 10. Predictions so plain that the Jewish evasions of them have not the least appearance of probability.

274. II. To shew that accordingly "Christ our passover is slain;" 1 Cor. v. 7. that Jesus our Messias *did* really and truly *die*.

275. Jesus of Nazareth on His crucifixion was so certainly dead that even they who wished, effected, &c. His death, believed and were satisfied with it: the chief priests, &c. But had they even doubted of it,...why did the sun put on mourning? why were the graves opened? but for a funeral? why did the earth quake? why were the rocks rent? ...but because the God of nature died? why did all the people who came together to see Him crucified, beat their breasts and return, but that they were assured "*it was finished?*" The merciless soldiers brake not His legs, merely because they found Him already dead whom they came to dispatch; and being enraged to be thus prevented, with an impertinent villany they pierce His side, thereby becoming but the stronger witnesses of His death. For out of His wounded side came blood and water, both as evident signs of His present death as certain seals of our future and eternal life. These are the two blessed sacraments of the spouse of Christ, each assuring her of the death of her beloved. For "know ye not that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ are baptized into His *death*?"

---

273. Quote prophecies fortelling Christ's death. 275. How is the reality of Christ's death established by the belief of hostile witnesses? And by certain attendant circumstances? How do both the Christian sacraments bear reference to the *death* of Christ, and to what particular circumstances connected with it?

Rom vi. 3. "As often as we eat this bread, and drink this cup, we shew forth the Lord's *death.*" 1 Cor. xi. 26.

276. Dead then our Saviour was upon the cross; and, being truly and properly mortal man, underwent a true and proper death, in the same manner as we die.....Now since we are then properly said to *die* when we *cease to live*, since life consists in the union to the body of the *soul*, whence flow *motion*, *sensation*, and whatsoever *vital* perfection, Death can be nothing else but the solution of that vital union, or the actual separation of the soul united before to the body.....When therefore we read that Christ our Saviour *died*, we must conceive it a true and proper death, consequently that His body was bereft of His soul and of all vital influence from the same.

277. That the unspotted soul of Jesus *was* thus actually separated from His body, that His body by that soul's secession was bereft of natural life, appears moreover by His own resignation, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit;" Luke xxiii. 46. and by the Evangelist's expression, "having said thus, He gave up the ghost."...So the eternal Son of God on the cross did properly and truly die.

278. This reality of His death is yet further illustrated from its *immediate* cause.....The torments which He endured did bring Him to that state in which life could not be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of supernatural power, must follow.——For Christ in His human nature had not only an aptitude, but a necessity, of dying;

---

276. What is the proper meaning of *death* in reference to human beings? and in what accordingly did the death of Christ consist? 277. Quote an expression used by Christ, and another by St Luke, (in connection with that of Christ's recorded by him,) which shew the reality of His death. 278. Illustrate also the reality of His death from

and as to any extrinsecal violence able according to the common course of nature to destroy in the body the aptitude indispensable to its continuance in union with the soul, He had *no natural* preservative.....—It is true indeed that He did voluntarily die: "No man taketh away My life from Me, but I lay it down of Myself;" John x. 18. It was in His power not to come into the power of His enemies, not to suffer the sentence of Pilate; to have come down from the cross: But when He had willingly submitted to that death, and endured those torments to the last, it was not in the power of His soul to continue any longer vitality to His exhausted body. He *voluntarily* took on Him a *necessity* of dying.—It is true also that "Pilate marvelled He was dead so soon," Mark xv. 44. and the two thieves lived longer,... but we read not of such long furrows on their backs as were made on His, nor had they such kind of agony as He was in the night before. What though "He cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost," whereon the centurion said, "Truly this was the Son of God?" Mark xv. 37, 39. The miracle was not that He should die, but that at the point of death He should cry out so loud.....—Should we imagine Christ by anticipation of the time of death to abstract His soul from future torments [naturally] necessary to cause it, we might say the Jews and Gentiles were *guilty* of His *death*, because they inflicted those torments on which in time death would follow, but could not properly say they *slew* Him; whereas St Peter expressly charges His enemies,

its *immediate* cause. Shew that His *voluntary* submission to death did not prevent the *necessary* operation of that immediate cause: Also that from His dying as soon as He did it must not be inferred that He miraculously hastened His own death. Quote requisite texts.

"Him ye.....have crucified and slain;" Acts ii. 23. So also v. 30.—Thus was the Lamb properly *slain*, and the Jews authors of His *death* as well as crucifixion.

279. III. To declare in what the nature and condition of the death of a person so totally singular *peculiarly* consisted.

280. There were two different substantial unions in Christ: one, of the parts of His human nature each to other;.....the other, of His natures human and Divine. (*a*) The *union* of the *parts* of His *human nature* was (as already shewn) *dissolved* on the cross, and as far then as Humanity consists in that union, so far the Humanity of Christ on His death did cease to be; but (*b*) The *union* of the *natures remained* still as to the *parts*, nor was the soul or body separated from the Divinity, but still subsisted, as before, by the subsistence of the second Person of the Trinity.

281. The truth of this assertion appears from the language of this very Creed, according to which the same Person (*i. e.* the eternal Son of God, as before proved) who was "conceived," "born," and "suffered," also "*was buried*," in respect of His body, and "*descended into hell*" in respect of His soul; so that neither His body nor His soul had lost their hypostatical union with the Word.

282. Again, as God redeemed us by His own blood, so hath it been the constant language of the Church that God died for us; which cannot

---

280. What two different *unions* existed in Christ? Which of them was dissolved by His death? 281. Shew that according to the language of the Creed neither the body nor the soul of Christ was by His death separated from His Divinity. 282. Shew that no such separation would be consistent with the Ecclesiastical language, founded on Scripture, that God died for us.

be true except the soul and body in the instant of separation were united to the Deity.

283. Indeed, since God never subtracts His grace from any without their abuse of it,.....we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from Christ, who never offended, and that in the highest act of obedience.

284. Christ, it is true, cried on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" But if that dereliction should signify the solution of the former union of His natures, the separation had been made *before* His *death.* Whereas those words only imply that He was bereft of such comforts from the Deity as should assuage His present torments.

285. It remains therefore that when our Saviour yielded up the ghost, He suffered only an external violence,.....whereon the disposition of His body failed His soul, and the soul deserted His body. But since no power hath any force against Omnipotence, since no finite agent could work on the union made with the Word, therefore that union still remained whole both to the soul and body.....Thus did Christ truly die :..... His soul and body were disjoined one from the other, but neither from Him that took them both together.

Practical uses of Belief that Christ was Dead.

286. This belief in necessary ; because the death of Christ, as the most essential part of His Mediatorship, most

---

283. Shew that Christ's innocence and obedience preclude the supposition of such a separation. 284. Shew that such a separation is not implied (what is?) by the exclamation, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" 285. Shew that the cause which effected a separation between the soul and body of Christ, could not separate either His body or soul from His Divinity. 286. Shew the practical uses of belief that Christ was

intimately concerns every function of the Mediator, as Prophet, Priest, and King.—(*a*) As to His Prophetical office, His death was necessary, i. For the *confirmation* of the *truth* of His *doctrine*. He was "the true and faithful witness, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession;" Rev. iii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 13. "This is He that came by water and blood; and there are three that bear witness in earth, &c." 1 John v. 6, 8. He preached to us a new "and better covenant, which was established upon better promises," Heb. viii. 6. and was to be ratified with His blood, "the blood of the everlasting covenant;" Heb. xiii. 20. See also Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxii. 20; Heb. x. 29; ix. 16.—ii. For the *perfection* of His *example*.....What an example was that *α.* of *faith in God*, "to lay down His life that He might take it again," John x. 17. "to commend His spirit" on the cross "into the hands of His Father," Luke xxiii. 46. and "for the joy that was set before Him to endure the cross, &c." Heb. xii. 2.—*β.* of *meekness*, &c. for "the Son of man to come not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many," Matt. xx. 28. to be "led like a sheep to the slaughter, &c." Acts viii. 32. See also Heb. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 8. —*γ.* of *obedience*, for the Son of God "to learn obedience by the things that He suffered;" Heb. v. 8. see also Gal. iv. 4; Phil. ii. 8; John xiv. 31. *δ.* of *charity*, to "die for us while we were yet sinners," Rom. v. 8. and enemies; compare John xv. 13. to pray on the cross for His murderers, "Father, forgive them, &c." Luke xxiii. 34. Thus Christ did "suffer for us, leaving us an example, &c." 1 Pet. ii. 21. and see iv. i. 2—(*b*) As to His *Sacerdotal* office, His death was necessary; i. In respect of *us*; *α.* in His *making* an *oblation*, propitiation, and satisfaction, for the *sins* of the whole world. [The matter under this head is in great measure anticipated in par. 102. which see. Heb. ix. 22; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; Rom. v. 10; Col. i. 21. are quoted both there and here by Pearson. See also Heb. v. 1; x. 4, 8, 9; Isai. liii. 10.]—*β.* in assuring us of the *efficacy* thereof; "if the blood of bulls, &c. sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ,.....purge our conscience, &c." Heb. ix. 13, 14. and of the *happiness* flowing from it; "He

---

Dead, from a consideration of the importance of His death in reference to all His Mediatorial offices.

that spared not His own Son, &c. how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" Rom. viii. 32. on which assurance we have "boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, &c." Heb. x. 19, 20.—ii. In respect of *Him; a.* in regard of *qualification* for His office, that He, having "suffered, being tempted, might be able to succour them that are tempted;" Heb. ii. 17, 18. [*See par.* 250., *toward end, and* 251. (*d*)]—*β.* in regard of *consummation* of His office. As the "High Priest once every year" for the atonement of the sins of the people entered into the Holy of Holies "not without blood," so "Christ being come an High-Priest of good things to come, &c." by His own blood entered in once into the holy place, &c." Heb. ix. 7, 11, 12.——(*c*) As to His *Regal* office, His death was necessary, i. For the *execution* of dominion. "O king, live for ever," Dan. iii. 9. is either the loyal or the flattering vote for temporal princes;..... whereas our Christ never shewed more sovereign power, &c. than by His death. It was not for nothing that Pilate ...wrote ....." The King of the Jews." That title on the cross signified that His regal power was active even there: for "having spoiled principalities, &c. He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it;" Col. ii. 15. and "through His death destroyed him that had the power of death, &c." Heb. ii. 14.—ii. For the *assecution* of further dominion. "The Spirit of Christ..... testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow;" 1 Pet. i. 11. See Psal. cx. 7; Phil. ii. 8, 9; Rom. xiv. 9. [*See par.* 251. (*c*).]

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. IV. §. 4.

287. I believe as a most infallible truth that the only-begotten Son of God, for the working out of our redemption did in our nature, which He took upon Him, truly die, so as by the force of those torments He felt His soul was separated from His body, and though neither His soul nor body was separated from the Divinity, yet the body bereft of the soul was left without the least vitality. Thus I believe in Jesus Christ, which was crucified and DEAD.

---

287. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief that Christ was *Dead*.

ART. IV. §. 5. AND BURIED.

288. This will be sufficiently explicated by shewing, I. That the promised Messias was to be buried: II. That our Jesus was so buried as the Messias was to be.

289. I. That the Messias was to be buried would follow from His being to die among the Jews, whose universal custom it was to bury their dead. We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers; and even for condemned criminals, who were not to be buried in their fathers' graves, there were public places of sepulture appointed. But moreover the burial of the Messias was

290. 1. Typically represented in the person of Jonas; as that prophet "was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so" was "the Son of man to be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth;" Matt. xii. 40.

291. 2. Prophetically foretold: i. *Intimated* by the Psalmist speaking in the person of Christ, "My flesh shall rest in hope: for Thou wilt not leave My soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption;" xvi. 9, 10. That *flesh* is there supposed only such, a body, dead, and *resting* in the grave the common habitation of the dead; yet *resting* there *in hope* that it should *never see corruption*, should rise thence before bodies in their graves are wont to putrify.—ii. *Expressly predicted* by Isaiah; "He was cut off out of the land of the living, and He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His

---

288. What is required for the explication of the clause declaring that Christ was *Buried?* 289. Why would the Messias' Burial be presumed to follow from His being to die among the Jews? 290. By what type was it represented? 291. How prophetically foretold?

death ;" liii. 8, 9. whence it is certain that He who was to be "cut off," *i. e.* the Messias (as already shewn) was to have a "grave," to be buried.

292. II. Our Jesus was accordingly thus buried : although this might seem repugnant to the manner of His death. For they who were sentenced by the Romans to crucifixion had not a sepulchre, but their bodies were exposed to the birds and beasts, or to the longer injury of the air and weather. And a guard was usually set about them, lest any pitying hand should rescue the body for sepulture. Under that Roman custom our Saviour's body was now on the cross, and the guard was set ; "the centurion and they that were with him ;" Matt. xxvii. 54. of whom the rest continued still after the centurion's departure to testify Christ's death to Pilate. How then can the ancient predictions be fulfilled.....?

293. By the Providence of Him who gave them ; Thus : 1. Jewish custom required that executed criminals should be buried, and that on the day of execution. Moses had expressly enjoined, "If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree ;.....thou shalt in any wise bury him that day ;" Deut. xxi. 22, 23. On this general custom and particular law, especially considering the sanctity of the day approaching, "the Jews..... besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away ;" John xix. 31.—2. Next, though by the common rule of

---

292. How might the Roman custom in cases of crucifixion seem repugnant to the expectation that *Jesus* would be buried ? 293. Shew how it was nevertheless brought about that the Burial of Jesus should take place in accordance with the ancient predictions. Quote requisite texts, &c.

Roman law sepulture was not permitted to the bodies of the crucified, yet permission was in the Magistrate's power. Pilate therefore who had crucified Jesus, though declaring Him innocent, merely because the Jews so desired, could not deny Him burial when they requested it.—3. Further, to secure that Christ should "make His grave" not as a criminal, which according to Jewish custom would now have followed, but "with the rich in His death," "there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, &c." and "went in boldly unto Pilate, and besought him that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave him leave, &c." See Matt. xxvii; Mark xv; Luke xxiii; John xix. Beside, "there came also Nicodemus,.....a ruler of the Jews, &c. and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes..... Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury;" John iii. 1, 10; xix. 39, 40.

294. Thus was the burial of the Son of God performed according to the custom of the people of God. For the understanding of which three things are to be considered: 1. What was done to the body to prepare it for the grave.....We find (*a*) the *spices*, and (*b*) the *linen clothes*. (*a*) When the woman brake the box of ointment, and poured it on Christ's head, Mark xiv. 3. 8., this was an *interpreted* unction of His body to the burying, according to His own words; and when, Christ being already risen, "Mary Magdalen and the other Mary brought the spices which they had prepared that they might come and anoint Him," Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 1., there was an *intended*

---

294. Give some account of the chief particulars to be considered with reference to the performance of our Saviour's Burial according to the custom of the Jews.

unction of Him: but *actually* He was interred with the spices brought by Nicodemus.—(*b*) The custom of wrapping in the linen clothes we see in the case of Lazarus rising from the grave; he came forth bound....." with grave clothes, &c." John xi. 44. In like manner, when our Saviour was risen, "Simon Peter went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lie, &c." John xx. 6, 7.—Thus, according to the custom of the Jews, was the body of Christ bound in several linen clothes, with an aromatical composition, and so prepared for the sepulchre.—2. How the sepulchre was prepared to receive His body. The custom of the Jews was also punctually observed in His burial in the new sepulchre which Joseph of Arimathea had *hewn out of the rock for his own tomb:* where they laid Jesus, and rolled a *great stone* to the *door* of the sepulchre; Matt. xxvii. 60; Mark xv. 46; John xix. 41..... After which stone was once rolled thither, the sepulchre was completed, and it was not lawful by the custom of the Jews any more to open the sepulchre. 3. How the persons interring our Saviour were fitted to fulfil the prophecy.....Joseph of Arimathea, a ruler, rich and honourable, yet inferior to Nicodemus, one of the great council of the Sanhedrim, these two, though fearful while He lived to acknowledge Him, are brought by Providence to inter Him: and thus, though the counsel of His enemies, the design of the Jews, "made His grave with the wicked," that He might be buried with them who were crucified with Him, yet "because He had done no violence, &c." the counsel of His Father, the design of heaven, put Him "with the rich in His death."

Practical uses of Belief that Christ was Buried.

295. This belief is necessary: (*a*) That we may be assured

---

295. What are the practical uses of belief that Christ

of the truth both of Christ's death and resurrection..... Pilate required to be satisfied that our Saviour was dead before he would give His body to be interred: Mark xv. 44, 45.....That we might believe in Christ truly risen from the dead, we must be assured that He died: of which we can have no greater assurance than this, that His body was delivered by His enemies from the cross, and laid by His disciples in the grave. (*b*) To work within us a correspondence with His burial. We are "buried with Him in baptism," Col. ii. 12. "buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life;" Rom. vi. 4.—(*c*) That Christ's disciples might for ever learn what honour was fit to be given and received at their funerals. See instances of the care of the primitive Christians in this point in the burials of Ananias (though he died for his sin), Acts v. 6. Stephen, viii. 2. and Dorcas, ix. 37.....When Christianity began to increase, the Greek and Roman custom of burning the bodies of the dead ceased; and after a few emperors had received baptism, there was not a body burnt in the Roman empire. For the first Christians wholly abstained from burning dead bodies, and followed the example of our Saviour's funeral; making use of precious ointments for the dead, which they refused while they lived. The description of the persons who interred Christ, and the enumeration of their virtues, and the everlasting commendation of her who brake the box of precious ointment for His burial, have been thought sufficient grounds for the decent sepulture of Christians. As natural reason teaches us to give some kind of respect to the dead bodies of men in reference to the souls which before inhabited them, so, and much more, the followers of our Saviour, looking on our bodies as living temples of the Holy Ghost, and bought by Christ, to be one day made like

---

was *Buried?* Quote texts.—(*c*) What was the usual Greek and Roman manner of disposing of the bodies of the dead? How and when did Burial come to take place of it throughout the Roman empire? What *Christian* reasons, in addition to the natural one, are there for paying respect to the bodies of the dead? What influence did the attention paid by the primitive Christians to the burial of the dead exercise on the heathens?

unto His glorious body, thought them not to be neglected after death, but carefully to be laid up in the wardrobe of the grave, with such due respect as might become the honour of the dead and comfort of the living. And this their decent custom by God's Providence proved very effectual in the conversion of the heathens: (Julian the Apostate reckoned it one great recommendation of Christianity to them.)

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. IV. §. 5.

296. I believe that the only-begotten Son of God for the confirmation of the truth of His death already past, and of His resurrection suddenly to follow, had His body, according to the custom of the Jews, prepared for a funeral, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in spices; and then deposited in a sepulchre hewn out of a rock, in which never man was laid before, and by rolling a stone to the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Christ was BURIED.

ART. V. He descended into hell: the third day He rose again from the dead.

§. 1. HE DESCENDED INTO HELL.

[1. Concerning (chiefly) the *Introduction* into the Creed, the *Reception*, and the *Truth*, as founded on Scripture, of the Proposition that Christ descended into Hell.]

297. The former part of this Article, of the *Descent into Hell*, has not been so anciently in the Creed, or so universally, as the rest. The first place we find it used in was the Church of Aquileia; the time we are sure it was used in the Creed of that Church was less than 400 years after Christ. After that it came into the Roman Creed and others, and has been acknowledged a part of the Apostles' Creed ever since.

---

296. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief that Christ was *buried*. 297. What Church, and at about what time, first introduced the Descent into Hell into her Creed?

298. Indeed, the *Descent into Hell* has always been accepted, though with a various exposition: and the Church of England at the Reformation made it one of the Articles of Religion. At first, in the reign of Edward VI., it was thus delivered, "That the body of Christ lay in the grave until His resurrection: but His spirit, which He gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in St Peter (1 Pet. iii. 19.) testifieth." And in the Creed set forth in metre still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered. But the Articles as afterwards settled in the reign of Elizabeth, and still in force, give no explication, nor reference to any place of Scripture*..... We may therefore with the greater liberty pass on to find out the true meaning of this Article, &c.

299. This [part of the] Article in the Aquileian Creed was delivered thus, "Descendit in *inferna*;" which "*inferna*" some of the Greeks translated "*Hell*," in relation to "Thou wilt not leave My soul in *hell*;" Acts ii. 27. others, "the *lower parts*," referring to "He descended into the *lower parts* of the earth;" Eph. iv. 9.

300. In the Aquileian Creed there was also no mention made of Christ's *Burial*. Ruffinus therefore truly observed that though the Roman and Oriental Creeds had *not* their *words*, they had the *sense* of them in the word "*Buried*." It appears, therefore, that the words when first used were intended only to express Christ's *Burial*.....

---

298. What was the antiquity of the reception of the Descent itself in some sense or other? 299. "*Hell*:" What was the term here used in the Aquileian Creed? With what variety translated by the Greeks? 300. How does it appear that the words "He descended into Hell" were

* Our Church however retains the passage from 1 Pet. iii. in the Epistle for Easter-Even. *G.*

Since, however, the Roman Creed has *added* the *Descent* to the *Burial*, and expressed that Descent by words more properly signifying *Hell*, it *cannot* be imagined that the Creed as it *now* stands should signify *only* the *Burial* of Christ by his *Descent into Hell*. But rather, *α*. since the ancient Church certainly believed that Christ some other way descended besides His Burial, *β*. since Ruffinus though interpreting those words of Burial only, yet has also mentioned His descent into hell as distinct from His sepulture, and *γ*. since they who added it to the Burial actually believed that the soul of Christ descended,—therefore for the exposition of the Creed it must be declared in what that descent consists.

301. The words as they lie in the Creed, "He descended into Hell," are *nowhere formally* and *expressly* delivered in Scripture, on the authority of which we believe whatsoever is delivered in the Creed.....we must therefore enquire in what Scriptures they are contained *virtually*, i. e. where the Holy Ghost doth deliver, in *what words soever*, the *doctrine* contained in this expression. ——Of several places of Scripture produced by the ancients as delivering this truth some unquestionably prove it not: but there are three which have always been thought of the greatest validity to confirm this Article:

302. i. "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" Eph. iv. 9. This many ancient fathers understood of the Descent of Christ's soul

---

when first used intended to express only Christ's Burial? Shew however that their meaning cannot be so restricted in the Creed as it now stands. 301. How must we proceed to ascertain the Scripture ground of belief in the doctrine that Christ descended into Hell? 302. "Now that He

into Hell, as placed in the lowest parts of the earth. But *though* this exposition *cannot* be *disproved*, ...*yet* we *cannot* be *assured* that the Apostle speaks here of a descent performed after Christ's death,—or even if so, that the lower parts of the earth did signify hell, or the place where the disembodied souls of men were tormented. *α.* For as it is written, "No man ascended up to heaven but He that descended from heaven;" John iii. 13. so this may signify merely, "In that He ascended, what is it but that He descended first?"—the "lower parts of the earth" possibly signifying no more than the place *beneath:* compare "Ye are from beneath, I am from above, &c." John viii. 23.—".....wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath;" Acts ii. 19.—*β.* Nay, they *may* well refer to His Incarnation; compare "My substance was..... curiously wrought in the lower parts of the earth;" Psal. cxxxix. 15; or to His Burial; compare "Those that seek my soul.....shall go into the lower parts of the earth;" Psal. lxiii. 9.

303. ii. Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit; by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison;" 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19.....This did our Church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the Descent; and so the ancient fathers applied it. But yet those words of St Peter have no such power of probation except we were certain that the *Spirit* there spoken of were the *soul* of *Christ*, and the *time* of

---

ascended, what is it but that He descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" Eph. iv. 9. Shew that we cannot be *assured* that this passage is to be understood of the Descent into Hell. 303. Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit; by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison;" 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19. Shew that this passage cannot properly be interpreted of the Descent into Hell.

the *preaching* were *after* His *death* and *before* His *resurrection.* The many difficulties attending which interpretation caused St Augustin at last to abandon it. But indeed the *Spirit* by which He is said to *preach* was.....that *Spirit by which He was quickened.....i. e.* the power of His Divinity; "Though He was crucified through weakness, yet He liveth by the power of God;" 2 Cor. xiii. 4.: in respect of which He preached to those which were disobedient in the days of Noah. [*See par.* 156.]

304. iii. This, the principal, text, "I foresaw the Lord, &c. My flesh shall rest in hope. Because Thou wilt not leave My soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption;" Psal. xvi. 8., &c. as quoted, and thus applied, by St Peter, He (David) "being a prophet.....spake of the resurrection of *Christ*, that *His* soul was not left in hell, &c." Acts ii. 25., &c. Now from *this* place the Article is clearly and infallibly deduced thus: if the soul of Christ were *not left in hell* at His resurrection, then it *was in hell before* His *resurrection:* but it was *not there before His death;* therefore upon or *after* His *death* and *before* His *resurrection*, it "descended into hell," and consequently the Creed truly delivers that Christ....."descended into hell."".....St Augustin draws the same conclusion from the above prophecy and application.

[II. Concerning the *Meaning* of the Proposition that Christ descended into Hell.]

---

304. Beside the two leading texts considered in the last two paragraphs, what other passage has been especially brought forward to prove the Descent into Hell? Give it as delivered in the Old Testament, and quoted and applied in the New; and shew that the truth of the proposition now under consideration is clearly established by it.

305. *What* that *hell* was to which Christ descended, and *how* He *descended* thither, being questioned is not easily determined.....Among the different opinions on this subject an explication must be looked for consistent with the other parts of the Creed, and comformable with Scripture.

306. 1. *Durandus* supposes this *Descent* to belong to the *soul*, and *Hell* to signify the place where the souls of dead men were in custody ; but understands "*descended*" *metaphorically*, of a *virtual, not local*, motion and of an *efficacious, not real*, presence of Christ's soul in that place ; by which [metaphorical] descent the effects of the death of Christ—effects attributed to His soul as the principal agent—were wrought on the souls in hell... An inadmissible exposition ; because too scholastically subtle for the Creed, and contradicting the text, "Thou shalt not leave My soul in hell ;" for if the *efficacy* of His death were His descent, then is He descended still, because that efficacy still remains.

307. 2. The next opinion, (Calvin's,) later than that of Durandus, is, that the Descent into Hell is the suffering of the torments of Hell ; that the soul of Christ did really and truly suffer all those pains due to the damned,.....which pains those now saved by His death should otherwise have endured,.....but that He, being their surety, suffered the same for them. But this interpretation cannot be admitted :

308. (*a*) *Not* if taken *literally :* because then *not true*..... i. There is in the damned a worm that never dieth, a *remorse* of conscience seated in the soul for what that soul hath done : but this could not be in Christ ; He took indeed on Himself the sins of those who otherwise had been damned, but that act of His was most virtuous, charitable, conformable to the will of God, consequently could not be the object of remorse. The grief and horror

---

305. Among the different opinions as to the meaning of the *Descent* of Christ into *Hell*, what kind of explication must be looked for ? 306. Shew that the (singular) opinion of Durandus as to the Descent being merely *metaphorical* (in what particular sense ?) is inadmissible. 307. What was Calvin's opinion as to the Descent into Hell ? 308. Shew that in a *literal* sense our Saviour certainly did ***not*** **suffer** ***infernal torments.***

suffered by Christ in His soul before crucifixion were clearly of a nature different from the sting of conscience in the damned; had reference to the sins, &c. of men, the justice, &c. of God. [*See par.* 250.]—ii. An essential part also of the torments of hell is a present and constant sense of the everlasting displeasure of God,... an absolute *despair* of any better condition, or the least relaxation. But Christ, who looked on the reward set before Him, even on the cross, and offered up Himself a sweet-smelling sacrifice, which could never be efficacious except offered in faith.....Christ, who knew the beginning, continuance, and conclusion, of His sufferings, who understood the determinate minute of His own death and resurrection, who had made a covenant with His Father.....and was fully assured that He could suffer no more and no longer than He had freely undertaken, He who was by those torments assured to overcome all the powers of hell, cannot possibly be said to be in the same condition with the damned, and literally to have endured the pains of hell.

309. (*b*) *Not* if taken *metaphorically;* because then *not pertinent:* i. e. if the torments of hell are metaphorically interpreted of those terrors and horrors of soul felt by our Saviour, which may be called infernal torments because of greater extremity than any other tortures of this life, and because accompanied with the sense of the wrath of God against the unrighteousness of men..... For *all* those pains which our Saviour felt.....were *antecedent* to His death :.....whereas the Descent into Hell, as now in the Creed, signifies something commenced *after* His *death*, contradistinguished to His Burial, and as it is considered in the Apostle's explication of the Psalmist (before quoted) *α.* is clearly to be understood of that which immediately *preceded* His *resurrection:* and *β.* that also grounded on a confidence totally repugnant to infernal pains.

310. 3. The third opinion, also very late, at least in the manner of explication, is, that in the words "Thou shalt

---

309. Shew that if our Saviour be said *metaphorically* to suffer *infernal torments*, in reference to the greatness of the sufferings which He endured in His soul, this interpretation would not be a *pertinent* explication. 310. What explication has been made of the clause under consideration as if referring to Burial only, founded on a certain translation (what?) of the original terms used for "soul" and "hell" in the passage on which the proposition of Christ's

not leave My soul in hell," the *soul* of Christ is taken for His *body* and *Hell* for the *grave:* when "He descended into Hell" would only denote His Burial.

311. (*a*) It must indeed be acknowledged, i. That the same word in the Psalmist's Hebrew (נפש), and the Apostle's Greek (ψυχή), which we translate *soul*, is elsewhere used for the *body* of a dead man, and so translated: as when we read in Moses of a Prohibition given to the High-Priest, or the Nazarite, of coming near a dead body, and of the pollution by the dead. Mr. Ainsworth, who translated the Pentateuch nearer the letter than the sense, accordingly renders, "Ye shall not make in your flesh any cutting for a *soul;*" Lev. xix. 28. "For a *soul* he shall not defile himself;" Lev. xxi. 1. and similarly in Lev. xxii. 4; Numb. v. 2; vi. 6. This *his* translation shews that in all these places the original word is that which usually signifies the *soul;* he may be well interpreted by *our* translation, which has *dead* or a *dead body*, teaching us that though in other places the word signifies the *soul*, yet in these it must be taken for the *body*, and that body bereft of the soul. And, ii. That the same word in the Psalmist's Hebrew (שאול), and the Apostle's Greek (ἅδης), which we translate *Hell*, certainly in some other places signifies no more than the *grave*, and is so translated. As where Ainsworth renders, "For I will go down unto my son mourning to *hell*," Gen. xxxvii. 35. "Ye shall bring down my grey hairs with sorrow unto *hell*," xlii. 38. *i. e.* in both texts, the *grave*, as our translation has it. And in this sense we say, "The Lord.....bringeth down to the *grave*, and bringeth up;" 1 Sam. ii. 6.

312. (*b*) Moreover, the exposition now considered has the great advantage, that he who first mentioned this *Descent* in the Creed (Ruffinus) interpreted it of the *Burial*, and where *this* Article was *expressed*, that of the *Burial* was *omitted.*

313. Yet there is no certainty of this interpretation. i. Because the same Ruffinus acknowledged also a Descent of Christ's *soul* into Hell, and those other Creeds which omitting the Burial expressed the Descent yet

---

Descent into Hell is founded? 311. Shew that it must be acknowledged that such a translation can be supported by instances of Scripture usage. 312. What other advantage must this explication be allowed to have? 313. Shew that, notwithstanding the advantages just mentioned,

shewed that by that descent they understood *not* that of the *body* but of the *soul*.—ii. Because they who *added* the *Descent* to the *Burial* must have understood by it something *distinct* from the Burial.- This interpretation, therefore, though it might perhaps be thought a *probable* one of the words of David, especially as belonging to David, cannot claim to be an exposition of the Creed as it now stands.

314. 4. The next opinion is, that the soul may well be understood *α*. either for the nobler part of man as distinguished from his body. *β*. or for his person, consisting of the soul and body, *γ*. or for the living soul as distinguished from the immortal spirit: but then the term *Hell* shall signify no *place*,.....only the *state* of men in death;.....according to which "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell," means, Thou shalt not suffer me to remain in the common state of the dead, &c. Inadmissible: for

315. (*a*) The notion that *Hades* denotes the *state* of the dead is wholly new, consequently cannot interpret that which represents something known and believed of old.—i. The Greeks by *Hades* always understood a *place* (though differing as to its situation) to which the disembodied souls of men were carried; and moreover they evidently could not understand by it the *state* of death, because they thought that many, *e. g.* they whose bodies were unburied, who were in the *state* of death, were *not* in *Hades*.—ii. The ancient fathers also, though differing much as to the place of the *Infernus*, never doubted but that it signified *some place*:- and if they had conceived any such notion [of it] as the *state* of death, &c. they needed not have fallen into doubts or questions, the patriarchs being as certainly in the *state* of death as Korah, Dathan, &c.

316. (*b*) [And] though it be certain that Christ did truly die, and after expiration was in the *state* of the dead, yet

---

this interpretation, however it might perhaps be thought a probable one of the words of David, cannot be allowed as an exposition of the Creed as it now stands. 314. What explication of the clause under consideration has been grounded on an interpretation of "Hell" as signifying the *state* or condition of the dead? 315. Shew that this explication is inadmissible; because contrary to all ancient authority as to the meaning of *Hades*. 316. Also, because

the Creed had declared this already, when it delivered that He was *Dead*. And though it might be urged that "He descended into Hell" might more stongly imply some *duration* in the state of death, yet, if Hell signify nothing else but the *state* of the dead, to "descend into Hell" is [after all] no more than *to be dead;*.....beside which someting more must have been intended by this addition to the Creed.

317. 5. There remains another interpretation, grounded on the general opinion of the Church of Christ in all ages, and on a probable exposition of the prophecy of the Psalmist.....Thou shalt not suffer that soul of mine,—i. e. *the spiritual or rational part* of Christ,—which shall be forced from my body by the violence of pain on the cross, but resigned into Thy hands, when it shall go into Hell,—i. e. *that place below where the souls of men departed are detained.*—to continue there as theirs have done; but shalt bring it shortly thence, and re-unite it to my body.——Several things are to be observed in respect both (*a*) of the matter of this exposition, and (*b*) of the authority of the fathers for it.

318. (*a*) i. The soul of man, when he dieth, dieth not, but returneth to Him that gave it:...—"Fear not them which...cannot kill the soul;" Matt. x. 28...—still exists and lives; either by its spiritual and immortal nature; or at least by the will of God and His preserving power; and thus existing when separated from the body is really in *some place, if not*, as proper bodies, by way of *circumscription*, *yet* by way of *determination*, and *indistancy*, so that it may be truly said, it is *here*, and *not elsewhere.*—ii. Nor must it be conceived, when thus separate, to *sleep*, &c. but still to

---

as the Creed now stands. the clause so explicated would be superfluous. 317. What interpretation — whereon grounded?— of Christ's Descent into Hell yet remains? 318. In regard to this exposition what does Pearson observe

understand and will, to feel joy or sorrow. Whereon is founded the different condition of disembodied souls, some by the mercy of God being placed in peace and joy, some left by His justice to sorrow and misery.—iii. As there was this different condition before our Saviour's death according to the difference of men in this life, the wicked and the just, so were there two societies of souls after death: one, of all them which departed in the same faith with Abel; happy in the presence of God:—the other, of all who, from the first so dying, died in their sins, under the wrath of God; put into the place of torment.—iv. Now the place where the disembodied souls are in rest or misery after death is certainly distinct from the place in which they lived. They continue not where they were when the body was left without life—go not with the body to the grave—but as the sepulchre is appointed for our flesh, so there is another receptacle for our spirits. Whence it follows that in death the soul certainly.....is translated to the place and society allotted to it by the mercy or justice of God. And not at present to enquire into the difference, &c. of those *several* habitations, (including them all as yet under the general notion of the infernal parts,) it will appear to have been the general judgment of the Church that the soul of Christ, His rational and intellectual soul, contradistinguished from His body was, after a true separation from His flesh, truly carried into those parts below where the souls of men before departed were detained; and *thus* "Descended into Hell."

319. (*b*) That this was the general opinion of the

---

concerning the existence, condition, place of the souls of men departed? 319. How does it appear that this

Church appears not only i. by the testimony of ancient successive writers who have delivered this exposition in terms incapable of any other interpretation, but also, ii. because it was generally used as an argument against the heresy of the Apollinarians, who held that Christ had no proper intellectual or rational soul, but that the Word was to Him in the place thereof. In refutation of which error the fathers argued that Christ *descended into hell*, (which the Apollinarians could not deny,) and that this *descent* was made not by His Divinity, nor by His body, but by His *soul*, consequently that He had a soul distinct from His flesh, and from the Word: a nugatory argument if it could have been answered by the heretics, as it now is by many, α. that His descent into Hell had no relation to His soul, only to the descent of His body into the grave, β. or that it was only a *virtual* descent... ..., γ. or that His soul was *not* His *intellectual spirit* or *immortal soul*, *but* His *living soul* which descended into Hell, *i. e.* continued in the state of death.——Moreover, the fathers did *not* prove *only* that the *animal* soul of Christ descended into hell: For their arguments would then have been vainly brought forward against the Apollinarians, who *allowed* such an *animal* human soul to Christ, though they *denied* Him a human *intellectual* one [*See par.* 207.] Certainly therefore the Catholic fathers did declare that the intellectual and immortal soul of Christ descended into Hell.

[III. Concerning (chiefly) the *Persons* to whose souls the soul of Christ descended, and the end for which He descended into Hell.]

320. A. The *Ancients*, though all agreeing in the real descent of the soul of Christ, yet respecting the Persons

---

exposition is grounded on the general opinion of the Church? 320. In what do the Ancients agree?—on

to whose souls He descended, and the end of His Descent, differed much; according to their several apprehensions of the condition of the dead, and nature of the place unto which the souls before our Saviour's death were gathered.

321. 1. Some, looking on "Hell," *Hades*, or *Infernus*, as the common receptacle of *all* souls, just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended to those of the patriarchs, &c. the people of God..... Of those who held this opinion, (*a*) some thought that Christ descended to that place of Hades where the souls of all the faithful from the death of Abel to that of Christ were detained, and.....translated them thence to a far more glorious place and happy condition in the heavens above: but (*b*) others understood no such change, conceiving that the souls of all men are detained below still, and are not to enter heaven till the general resurrection.....

322. 3. Others thought *Hades* or *Infernus* was *never* taken in Scripture for any place of *happiness*—consequently that the souls of the patriarchs did *not* reside *there*—consequently that the soul of Christ did *not* descend to *them*, but to those who were in the proper *Hell* or place of torment;—and these conceived that the end of His descent was to deliver souls from those miseries they felt, and to translate them to a happy place and glorious condition. (*a*) They who thought that *all* souls were thus released were called heretics; but (*b*) to believe that *many* were delivered was by them and many others accounted orthodox.

323. The means by which they conceived the souls of men thus delivered was the application to them of Christ's death, propounded to them by the preaching of the Gospel; accordingly they thought the soul of Christ

---

what *leading* subjects did they differ?—as regards Christ's descent into Hell? 321. By such of the Ancients as believed "Hell" the *general* receptacle of *all* souls, to *whose* souls was Christ thought to descend? and on what remarkable point did they differ respecting the effect produced by His descent? 322. By such of the ancients as thought *Hades never* in Scripture denoted a place of *happiness*, to whose souls was Christ believed to descend? For what end? And what difference of opinion was there among them as to the number of the souls to whom the effect of His descent extended? 323. By what means did

descended into Hell to preach the Gospel to the spirits there, that they might receive Him who before believed in Him, or that they might believe in Him who before rejected Him.

324. But this cannot be received as the end, or way to effect the end, of Christ's Descent, nor be regarded as an illustration of this Article. For, i. It has been shewn that the place of St Peter, so often mentioned for it, is inapplicable.—ii. The ancients seem to have so interpreted that place only because induced by Apocryphal writings. A passage from Jeremiah was first produced, that "the Lord God of Israel remembered His dead, which slept in the land of the grave, and descended unto them, to preach unto them His salvation:" which verse being *nowhere* extant in that prophet or any other, was said to have been once in the Septuagint, but expunged by the Jews—which is scarcely credible; and even if it were true, the verse would be of doubtful authority, as never found in the Hebrew. The authority also of Hermes in his *Pastor* was alleged, a book of no good authority, and in this particular most extravagant.—iii. Moreover, this notion of the end of Christ's Descent is *α.* false, and inconsistent with the nature, &c. of the gospel, (which is to be preached with such commands, &c. as can concern only those in this life,) and *β.* incongruous to the state of those souls to whom Christ is supposed to preach: for the *saints before departed* were never "disobedient in the days of Noah," nor could need the publication of the gospel after Christ's death, having been ... accepted in Him while they lived, &c. And they who *died in disobedience*, &c. cannot appear proper objects for the gospel preached: the rich man in their condition, Luke xvi, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach to his living brethren, but we find no hopes he had of any to come from the living to preach unto him, &c.

325. Nor is this *preaching* only to be *rejected* as a *means* to produce the effect of Christ's Descent; but the pretended *effect* itself, whether as to the just or unjust, is *inadmissible*. For the opinion of some of the ancients,

---

they conceive deliverance to be wrought for the souls in Hell? 324. Shew that their notion of the *end*, or *means to effect the end*, of Christ's Descent, cannot be admitted; as wanting good authority, and false, &c. in itself. 325, 326. Shew also that their opinion as to the *effect* thus supposed to

that Christ descended into hell that He might deliver, and translate to a place of happiness, some of the souls there tormented, deserves no acceptance :

326. i. Neither in respect of the authority on which it is built ; *i. e.* Acts ii. 24. "whom God hath raised up, loosing the pains of *hell*," for *so* they read it, whence they argue thus ; God *did* loose the pains of hell when Christ was raised—but those pains never took hold of Christ Himself, who was not to suffer any thing after death—nor of the saints of old, who even if granted to have been in a place sometimes called *Hell*, yet were there in happiness—wherefore since there were none to be loosed from those pains but those who, having died in their sins, were involved in them, Christ descending into Hell delivered some of the damned souls from their torments there.—But α. though the Latin and some other translations render it "the pains of *hell*," and some copies and divers fathers read so, yet the original Greek propounds it thus "……the pains of *death*,"—β. And even if the original text had "the pains of *hell*," it would follow…… only that Christ was preserved from enduring them.

327. ii. Nor in respect of the doctrine contained in it. The souls of men were never cast into infernal torments (*everlasting* punishment, &c. see Matt. xxv. 41, 46. Mark ix. 44.) to be delivered from them. The days after death were never made for opportunities for a better life……Nor is it to be thought that the damnation of all sinners since the death of Christ is inevitable and eternal, but was not so before ; that faith and repentance are now indispensably necessary to salvation, but before were not ….." We must *all* appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that *every one* may receive the things done in his body ;" 2 Cor. v. 10……This life is given unto men to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, but after death cometh judgment, reflecting on the life that is past, not expecting amendment or conversion then. He that liveth and believeth in Christ shall never die ; he that believeth, though he die, yet shall he live ; but he that dieth in unbelief shall neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those which *went before* as of those which *come after* our Saviour, because He was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world.

---

be wrought by Christ's Descent is not to be admitted in respect of the authority on which it was built : 327. Nor in respect of the doctrine involved in it.

328. B. That Christ by virtue of His Descent delivered the souls of the saints of old from the place and state in which they were before, and descended into Hell that He might translate them to a place and state far more glorious and happy, has in the later ages of the Church been the vulgar opinion of most men, and that as if it followed from the denial of the former: He delivered not the souls of the damned; therefore He delivered the souls of believers, and of them alone. Till the *Schools* at last delivered it as a point of faith that the soul of Christ descending into Hell delivered thence (from that place of it which they call *Limbus Patrum*) all the souls in the bosom of Abraham, and conferred on them actual beatitude, which before they enjoyed not: laying this on two grounds, *α*. That the souls of saints departed saw not God; and *β*. That Christ by His death opened the kingdom of heaven.

329. (*a*) But this opinion has not the consent of antiquity which it pretends to. For, *α*. The most ancient of all the fathers whose writings are extant, . thought the souls of the saints not yet in heaven, nor to be removed from the place in which they were before Christ's death, till the general resurrection.—*β*. Others thought the bosom of Abraham was not in any place which could be termed *Hell* ..... —*γ*. Others, yet who thought Christ did deliver the patriarchs from their infernal mansions, did *not* think so *exclusively*, ...but conceived that *many* – doubted whether not *all*—the damned spirits were saved as well as the patriarchs.

330. (*b*) Still less is there any certainty as to the truth of it. For, *α* There is no certainty that the souls of the just were kept in any place below which was, or may be called, *Hell*;—Abraham's bosom might as well be in the heavens above;—the Scriptures nowhere tell us that the spirits of just men went to, or remain in, *Hell*;—the place

---

328. What opinion respecting the end of Christ's Descent into Hell became prevalent in the later ages of the Church, and was delivered as a matter of faith by the *Schools*? How was it supposed to follow from a denial of the deliverance of the souls of the damned? 329. Shew that the opinion vainly claims to be founded on the consent of antiquity. Mention briefly some opinions of the most ancient fathers inconsistent with it. 330. Shew that there is no certainty as to the truth of that opinion, either as regards the place

in which the rich man after death was in torments is called *Hell*, but not so that (far distant) into which the angels carried the poor man's soul; nor is it likely that the angels which see the face of God should be sent to convey the souls of the just into that place where the face of God cannot be seen;—Enoch and Elias, translated, seem not conveyed to a place where there is no vision of God: and yet it is probable Moses was with Elias as well before as when upon the Mount, nor is there reason to conceive of Abraham as in a worse place, &c. than Enoch, having as great "a testimony that he pleased God," Heb. xi. 5. as Enoch had.—*β*. There is no certainty that the patriarchs, &c. are *now* in another place and better condition than before the death of our Saviour; — no intimation of such a change in Scripture:—"Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the *kingdom of heaven;*" Matt. viii. 11. *there* then the Gentiles who came in to Christ found the patriarchs: and we cannot perceive that they found them any where else than Lazarus did. Compare the account of the rich man, Luke xvi., in hell, seeing Abraham afar off, *before the death of Christ*, with the description of those who in weeping, &c. saw Abraham, &c. Luke xiii. 28. when the Gentiles were brought in.—*γ*. Though it were certain that the souls of the saints *had been* in a place called Hell, and *were* now in a better condition than they were before Christ's death, (neither allowed,) it would not follow that Christ *descended into hell* to effect this: for it *might not* be performed before His resurrection—or till after His ascension; *might* be attributed to the merit of His passion, *might* have no dependence on His descension.

331. (*a*) Wherefore since [*moreover, on the other hand,*] it *is* most *certain*, that the death of Christ was as effectual for the redemption of the saints before Him as for those which followed Him,.....since Abraham is the Father of us all, and we are *now* called but to walk in the steps of the faith of that Father, Rom. iv. 12, 16, since the bosom of Abraham is clearly propounded in Scripture as the place to which the angels before the death of Christ

---

of the souls of the just, or any change made in their condition, or the dependence of such (supposed) change on the Descent of Christ into Hell. 331. Mention some things certainly contained in Scripture which are adverse

conveyed the souls of those who departed in God's favour, and is also promised to them which should believe in Christ after His death, (for so much is implied in the feasting with Abraham, Matt. viii. 11. observe the original term—consider the posture anciently used in feasting—see John xiii. 23,) since we can find no difference or translation of the bosom of Abraham, and yet it is a comfort still to us (so St Augustin) that we shall go to him, and while we hope so never fear that we shall go to hell, it cannot be admitted that the end of Christ's Descent into Hell was to convey the souls of Abraham, &c. thence, nor that such an action is referred to in the words, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell."

332. C. Another opinion hath obtained, especially in our Church, that the end for which our Saviour descended into Hell was to triumph over Satan and the powers below within their own dominions. This has been received as grounded on these Scriptures, with consent of fathers,—Col. ii 15. and Eph. iv. 8, 9. i. Ye were "buried with Christ in baptism, with whom ye were also raised; and when ye were dead in sins, He quickened you together with Him, forgiving your sins, and cancelling the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and spoiling powers and principalities, He made an open show of them triumphing over them *in Himself*," (*so* they read it), Col. ii. 12—15. *i. e.* say they, ye died and were buried with Christ, who fastened the handwriting of ordinances to the cross, &c. Ye likewise were quickened and raised together with Christ, who spoiled powers and principalities and triumphed over them in His own person. So that "spoiling principalities and powers" is *not* referred to the *cross*, but to Christ's *resurrection*.—ii. This Triumph over Satan, &c. is in Eph iv. 8, 9. set down as a consequent to Christ's death, and pertinent to His resurrection; "Ascending on high

---

to that opinion. How does it appear that the bosom of Abraham is still the place promised to the souls of the faithful? 332. What other opinion has obtained, especially in our Church,—concerning a triumph achieved by Christ's Descent into Hell? "Having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them.....;" Col. ii. 15. "When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended

He led captivity captive :" and this "He ascended, what meaneth it, but that He descended first into the lower parts of the earth" so that ascending from the lower part of the earth He "led captivity captive," which is all one with He "triumphed over powers and principalities."—With this conjunction, &c. of the Apostle's words, together with the interpretation of the ancient fathers, they conceive the Triumph above mentioned sufficiently demonstrated to have been achieved by Christ in Hell after His death, and before His resurrection :—But

333. (*a*) i. It cannot be proved that the Triumph, Col. ii. 15, is not referred to the cross but to the resurrection ; that the *blotting out*, &c. belong precisely to our *burial with Him*, and the *triumphing*, &c. particularly to our being *quickened together with Him*, or that the *blotting out* was performed at *one* time, the *triumphing* at *another*. Our present translation attributes it expressly to the Cross....."*in it*;" and though anciently it have been read..."*in Himself*," yet....."*in Himself*," *proves not* that it was performed *elsewhere* than on the cross.....The ancient Greek fathers read "*in it*," and interpret the Triumph of His death ; and those others of the Latin Church who read "*in Himself*," acknowledge with the Greeks the cross.....the place in which the victory over Satan was obtained.—ii. Nor will Col. ii. 15. become more effectual for the alleged conclusion by the addition of Eph. iv. 8, 9. For, as before shewn, the *descending* into the *lower parts of the earth* does not necessarily signify His Descent into *Hell* ..And even were that signification granted,.....it would *not* follow from that Scripture that Christ triumphed over Satan *while* His soul was *in Hell*, *only* that the same Christ who led captivity captive, *descended* first *into hell*...—Nay further, the ascent mentioned by St Paul.....evidently signifies the Ascension forty days *after* His Resurrection. It is not an ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth but...an

---

first into the lower parts of the earth?" Eph. iv. 8, 9. How were these passages interpreted (the former in connection with the preceding verses) and conjoined by the supporters of this opinion? 333. Shew that the two Scriptures above mentioned are not sufficient to found the conclusion alleged : (—making any requisite remarks respecting the differing translations, . "triumphing...*in it*," and..." triumphing...*in Himself*," Col. ii. 15.) What is the

ascending up *on high*, even "far above all heavens." Now the *leading captivity captive* belongs clearly, as an immediate effect, to *this* ascent, not to any preceding descent. It is *not* said that He *descended first* to *lead captivity captive*,.. ...*nor* that when He had led captivity captive, He ascended.....*but* expressly, *ascending up on high, He led captivity captive.* (ἀναβὰς...ἠχμαλώτευσεν...) So that by the two Scriptures alleged no more can be proved than that Christ *triumphed* over principalities, &c. *on the cross*, and *led captivity captive* at His *Ascension into heaven.* (Which moreover is rather *opposed* to the supposition of any end to be answered by Christ's Descent into Hell to triumph *there.*)

334. (*b*) The Testimonies of the fathers will appear of small validity to confirm *this* Triumphal Descent.....In vain shall we pretend that Christ descended into Hell to lead captivity captive, if we withal maintain that when He descended thither He brought away none that were captives there. The notion which the fathers had who spake of Christ's Triumph was that the souls of men were conquered by Satan, and after death brought into captivity, and that the soul of Christ descended to the place where they were, released them from that bondage and brought them out of the possession of the Devil...—Wherefore, since the Scriptures teach us not that Christ triumphed in Hell, since the Triumph mentioned by the fathers was either in relation to the damned souls, which Christ took out of torment, according to some, or, according to others, to the spirits of the just, which He took out of those infernal habitations, since we have already thought fit not to admit either of these two as the effect of Christ's Descent, we cannot acknowledge this as the proper end of the Article.

335. (*c*) And moreover, David's words in the person of Christ, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell," could not be intended to signify ".....Thou shalt not leave me there...redeeming the prisoners, ..victoriously triumphing, &c."—cannot admit [as on the supposition combated they must admit] an interpretation involving a glorious,

---

full extent of the conclusion which properly follows from them? and how is *that* conclusion unfavourable to the opinion now considered! 334. Shew that the testimonies of the fathers are vainly and *inconsistently* alleged in support of this opinion. 335. "Thou shalt not leave my soul

happy, and triumphant condition, which is not a subject capable of dereliction...

336. D. (*a*) This leads me to the end which I conceive most comformable to the words of the prophet, "Thou shalt not leave, &c." on which our explication has been hitherto grounded; and least liable to question or objection. We have already shewn the substance of the article to consist in this, that the soul of Christ, really separated from His body by death, did truly pass unto the place below where the souls of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which He did so was, that He might [fully] undergo the condition of a dead man as well as of a living.....All that was necessary for our redemption by way of satisfaction and merit was already performed on the cross; and all that was necessary for the actual collation and exhibition of what was merited there, was to be effected on or after His resurrection: in the interim, therefore, there is nothing left, at least known to us, but to satisfy the law of death. This He undertook to do, and did: and though the ancient fathers by the several additions of other ends have somewhat obscured this, yet it may be sufficiently observed in their writings.

337. (*b*) Moreover, by the Descent of Christ into Hell all who believe in Him are secured from descending thither; He went unto those regions of darkness that our souls might never come into those torments that are there. By His descent He freed us from our fears, as by His ascension He secured us of our hopes....."Through death He destroyed him that had the power of death, that is,

---

in hell:" Shew that these words are adverse to this opinion. 336. What does Pearson conclude to be the end of Christ's Descent into Hell most conformable to the words of the Psalmist, and least liable to objection? 337. What benefit and encouragement do believers receive from the Descent of

the Devil," and by His actual Descent into the dominion of him so destroyed secured all who have an interest in Him of the same freedom which He had. Which truth is also still preserved (though among many strange conceptions) in the writings of the fathers.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. V. §. 1.

338. I assent to this as a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and His soul was separated from His body, though His body were dead, yet His soul died not, but yet that it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die, and since He died in the similitude of a sinner, His soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who died for their sins, and so wholly underwent the law of death; but because there was no sin in Him, and He had fully satisfied for the sins of others which He took upon Him, therefore, as God suffered not His Holy One to see corruption, so He left not His soul in Hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all who belong to Christ, of never coming under the power of Satan, nor suffering in the flames prepared for the Devil and his angels.—Thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that Christ DESCENDED INTO HELL.

[*** See Campbell's Prelim. Diss. VI. and Bp. Horsley's Sermon on 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20. *G.*] "The whole sermon deserves careful attention, and should be compared with Bp. Middleton, on 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is to be lamented that Bp. Pearson, in his most learned and elaborate article on the Descent into Hell, should have written less lucidly that is his wont. In more passages than one, unless I greatly misunderstand him, he has contradicted himself. At one time he defines hell as the place of departed spirits, and makes our Lord's descent thither no more than a passing into the state of the dead. At another time he argues, as if hell meant the place of torments, and says

---

Christ into Hell? 338. Give a summary of the manner in which a Christian may express his belief in the fact,—and in the purposes thereby to be answered,—that Christ *Descended into Hell.*

that Christ went there to save us from going thither, for which he quotes Tertullian, who, however, mentions the opinion only to condemn it." [Bp. H. Browne; Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, Art. III., note at end.]

ART. V. §. 2. THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD.

339. This part, constantly delivered without the least alteration, contains

340. Particular I. The action itself; *He rose again;* to illustrate which it must be shewn

341. I. That the promised Messias was to rise from the dead. This was

342. 1. Prophesied. i. David suffered great oppositions, which he thus expressed of himself, and foretold of the Messias (of whom he was a type); "The kings of the earth set themselves, &c. against the Lord, and against His Anointed;" Psal. ii. 2. Whence "against the holy child Jesus, &c. both Herod and Pontius Pilate, &c. were gathered together, &c." Acts iv. 27, 28. But notwithstanding all this, it was spoken of David, and foretold of his Son, "yet have I set Mine anointed, &c.....The Lord hath said unto Me, Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee;" Psal. ii. 6, 7. As therefore the persecution in respect of David amounted only to a depression of him, and therefore *his* exaltation was a settling in the kingdom, so, since the conspiration against the Messias amounted to a real death, *His* exaltation must include a resurrection. And since he who rises from the dead begins as it were another life, &c., God saying of

---

339. What may be observed as to the antiquity, &c. of that part of this Art. which asserts Christ's Resurrection? 340, 348, 355. What are the Particulars contained in it? 341, 342. How was it *prophesied* that the Messias was to

His Anointed, "Thou art My Son, &c." foretold that He would raise the Messias from death to life.—ii More clearly delivered, Psal. xvi. 10., "My flesh shall rest in hope, &c. &c." Spoken of the resurrection of *Christ:* [*see pars.* 304, 317.] *His* soul and body, to be separated by His death &c.....were soon to be reunited, and rise again. —iii. Again, the Messias was to be raised, so as never to die again.....God promising, "I will make an everlasting covenant with you," Isai. lv. 3. (of which the Messias was to be the Mediator, and to ratify it by His death,) and adding "even the sure mercies of David," could signify no less than that Christ, first given to us in a mortal condition in which He was to die, should afterwards be given in an immutable state, consequently being dead should rise to eternal life.

343. 2. Typified. i. *Joseph*, ordained to save from death his brethren who would have slain him, represents the Son of God who, slain by us, yet dying saved us;—in the dungeon typifies Christ's death; taken out thence, His resurrection; raised to power next to Pharaoh, Christ's session at the right hand of His Father.—ii. *Isaac* was sacrificed and yet lived, to shew that Christ should truly die and rise again. Abraham offered him up, "accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure;" Heb. xi. 19. In Abraham's *intention* Isaac died, in his *expectation* was to rise from the dead, in his *acceptation* being spared was received from the dead...

344. II. That Jesus, our Messias, did accordingly so rise. This is delivered and confirmed by Testimonies

---

rise again? 343. How *typified*? 344, 345. By what *human* testimonies was it established that *Jesus*, our Messias,

345. 1. Human: (*a*) His friends: i. The pious women; who thought..to anoint Him dead, found Him living,..."worshipped Him,"..."ran to bring His disciples word;" Matt. xxviii. 8, 9.—ii. The Apostles; "to whom He shewed Himself alive after His passion, &c." Acts i. 3. who "with great power gave witness of His resurrection;" Acts iv. 33. the principal part of whose office consisted in this testimony; into the place of Judas one was of necessity to be ordained to be a witness of it. Acts i. 21, 22.—iii. The rest of the disciples; to whom He appeared, even to "500 brethren at once;" 1 Cor. xv. 6.—(*b*) Even His enemies: those soldiers that watched at His sepulchre...who at the sight of an angel...shook and became as dead men, while He whom they kept became alive; even some of these "came... and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done;" Matt. xxviii. 3, 4, 11.

346. 2. Angelical: i. An angel..."came and rolled back the stone from the door, &c." Matt. xxviii. 2. ii.—"Two angels in white,....." said unto the women, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? &c." John xx. 12; Luke xxiv. 5.

347. 3. Divine....."The witness of God is greater;" 1 John v. 9. Who sufficiently attested this resurrection, not only i. because no power but that of God could effect it; but, ii. as our Saviour said, "The Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me, and ye (the Apostles) shall bear witness, &c." John xv. 26, 27. The Spirit of God sent down on the Apostles thereby testified that Christ was risen, because sent by Him from the Father; and the Apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because

---

accordingly rose again? 346. By what *angelical* testimonies? 347. In what respects was the Resurrection of Jesus *Divinely* testified?

enlightened, comforted, &c. in their testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God raised up Jesus "and shewed him openly...unto witnesses chosen before of God, &c." Acts x. 40, 41.

348. Particular II. The Verity, &c. of that resurrection; *From the Dead;* concerning which we must

349. I. Consider what are the essential characters of a true resurrection: The proper notion of which consists in this, that it is *a substantial change, by which what was before and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again.*—1. A *change: not* a second or *new creation*, as if a man or angel were *annihilated*, and *made again* out of *nothing*.....2. A *substantial* change: *not an accidental alteration*, as from sickness to health.... 3. A change of what *was* before, and *was corrupted*; α. things *incorruptible* cannot be reproduced; β. and of things *corruptible, some*, the forms of inanimate bodies, and all irrational souls, when *corrupted, cease to be*, consequently even if such were reproduced out of the same matter, there would *not* be a restitution of the *same individual, only* of the *same species* by *another individual.*—But when a rational soul is separated from its body, which is the corruption of a man, that soul still exists, and is capable of reunion with the body; and if these two be again united by an essential and vital union, from which life necessarily flows, then the *same man* lives who lived before, and consequently this reunion is a perfect and proper resurrection from death to life...

---

349. Define in what a true Resurrection consists: noticing how it differs from a new creation, and from an accidental alteration, also how it *cannot* be predicated of things *incorruptible*, nor of *some* (what?) things *corruptible*, and how it takes place with respect to a human being.

350. II. Shew that Christ did thus truly and properly rise from the dead.

351. 1. [As to Himself, in His human nature,] (*a*) He lived a true and proper life, &c.—(*b*) He suffered a true dissolution at His death, His soul being really separated from His body, and His body left without vitality; &c.—(*c*) The *same soul* was reunited to the *same body*, and *so* He *lived again* the *same man*. For, i. As to His *body;* His Apostles were sufficiently assured α. of its *verity*, by Himself, "Handle me, &c. for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, &c." Luke xxiv. 37, 39. and β. of its *identity*, "Behold My hands, &c. that it is I Myself;" "Reach hither thy finger, &c." (to Thomas) John xx. 27.—ii. As to His *soul;* He shewed α. that the body they saw was truly informed with a human *soul:* He gave them an argument of the *vegetative and nutritive* faculty;..."Have ye here any meat?...and He... did eat before them;" Luke xxiv. 41, &c.—of the *sensitive* part, conversing with them, shewing Himself, seeing and hearing them;—of His *rational and intellectual* soul, by speaking to them and discoursing out of the Scriptures, &c.—β. that it was also the *same soul* by which that body lived before; testifying His Divinity by the miracle of the catching of the fishes, by breathing on the Apostles the Holy Ghost, by ascending into heaven; and thus shewing, since the Divinity never was so united to any human soul but only in that person, that this was the same soul with which He lived and wrought all the miracles before.

350, 351. Shew that Christ truly thus rose again, by Scripture proofs that after His resurrection He had a real human body and a real human soul, identical with the body and the soul which He had before.

352. 2. The Cause of Christ's Resurrection is also to be considered.

353. (*a*) As to the *meritorious* cause of it, *that* was Christ Himself. For He by His voluntary sufferings in life, and exact obedience at death, truly deserved to be raised to life again.....Now since He suffered both in soul and body, since whatsoever suffered was by merit of His passion to be exalted, and since all other degrees of exaltation presuppose that of resurrection, therefore Christ truly rose from the dead with the same soul and the same body.....

354. (*b*) As to the *efficient* cause of it, the *Principal* cause (whatsoever instrumental action might concur) was God Himself: none but Omnipotent power can raise the dead. "This Jesus hath God raised up;" Acts ii. 32. And generally in Scripture as our, so Christ's, resurrection is attributed to God.....Expressed with unparalleled force, Eph. i. 19. "that we may know what is the exceeding greatness of His power, &c."—In Scripture the raising of Christ is attributed to God the Father ("Paul an Apostle,...by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead;" Gal. i. 1.), but *not* to the Father *alone*. For to whomsoever that infinite power belongs by which Christ was raised, that person must be acknowledged to have raised Him. And the eternal Son of God being (as already proved) and the Holy Ghost being (as will hereafter be shewn) of the same essence, consequently of the same power, with the Father, therefore the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, raised Christ from the dead. Of the Son moreover this is expressly delivered,

---

352, 353. Shew that Christ truly rose again in the same soul and body, from a consideration of the *meritorious* cause of His resurrection. 354. Shew the same from a consideration of the *efficient* cause of it. Why must the

and that by Himself. The Socinians weakly maintain that God the Father *only* raised Christ, saying the Apostles always attribute His resurrection generally to God, or particularly to the Father. For if the Apostles taught it only so, yet if Christ taught us something more, we must believe that also. *He* said "Destroy this temple and in three days *I* will raise it up;" John ii. 19. explicated by St John, "He spake of the temple of His body," ii. 21. very properly so called, because "the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Him bodily;" Col. ii. 9. And "when He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered...and they believed the Scripture and the word that Jesus had said;" John ii. 22. The Apostles then *did believe* that *Christ raised Himself.*——The Socinians strangely oppose this argument, alleging that Christ, raised to life by the Father, lifted and raised His body out of the grave, as the man sick of the palsy raised himself from the bed, or as we shall raise ourselves out of the graves when the trump shall sound; and could do nothing more. But if this were all, our Saviour might as well have said, "Destroy this temple, and.....*any one of you* may raise it up."..... But to raise a body which is dead is, in Scripture language, to give life to it; "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son, &c." John v. 21. He then which quickeneth the dead bodies of others when He raiseth them, quickened His own body when He raised that. The temple is supposed here to be *dissolved*, and being so to be *raised again*; therefore the suscitation must answer to the

---

resurrection of Christ be attributed to *God* generally, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Quote texts in which it is ascribed to God the *Father*. Shew that in Scripture it is also ascribed to God the *Son*. How do the Socinians

dissolution.....The temple of Christ's body *was dissolved* (not by any dissolution of its parts—He saw no corruption—but) by the separation of His soul, for the temple *standing* was the body *living*, and therefore the *raising* of the *dissolved* temple was the *quickening* of the body...to lift it up out of the sepulchre *when* before *quickened* were *not* to raise a *dissolved* temple...—Moreover, it is *false* that our Saviour had power *only* to lift up His revived body: He speaks expressly of Himself, "I lay down My life (or soul) that I might take it again, I have power to lay it down: and.....to take it again;" John x. 17, 18.....By taking of His life again He shewed Himself to be "the Resurrection and the life,"..."was declared to be the Son of God with power...by the resurrection from the dead," Rom. i. 3, 4. which He had not thus declared Himself, if He had merely lifted up His revived body, which any other person might have done.——From this consideration of the *efficient* cause of Christ's resurrection we are yet further assured that He truly rose from the dead in the same soul and the same body.—The *Father* raised His own Son; and as during His life He had declared Him His "well beloved Son," Matt. iii. 17. so after His death it was the *same* person of whom He spake by the prophet, "Thou art My Son, this day, &c." Psal. ii. 7.—*Christ* Himself having power to raise Himself, truly and totally *arose both* in *soul* and *body* by that Divinity which was never separated from either.

355. Particular III. The circumstance of time *The Third Day:* which requires to be considered;

---

attempt to deny this? Shew the futility of their arguments. How are we especially assured of the truth of Christ's proper resurrection in the same soul and body, from a consideration of Him as raised by the Father, and as raised by Himself?

356. A. In respect of the *distance* of the time of Christ's resurrection, as being after three days.

357. I. The Messias...was not to rise before, and was to rise upon, the third day from His death. The prophet Jonas, "three days and three nights in the whale's belly," Matt. xii. 40. then by God's command rendered safe on dry land, and sent a preacher of repentance to Nineveh, was an express type of the Messias, who was to preach repentance and remission of sins to all nations, who was to be "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," and then restored to the land of the living.

358. Jesus, our (proved) Messias, accordingly was so long and no longer dead as to rise "the third day." The distance between His death and resurrection is to be considered

359. 1. *Generally*, as *some* space of time. (*a*) Christ did *not*, would *not*, *suddenly* rise, lest any should doubt that He ever died. We which are to believe both His death and His life (both necessary for us) were to be assured of both. That, therefore, we may be certified of His death, He did *some* time continue it.....The reward of His resurrection, due immediately on His passion, He would not immediately receive, lest either of them being questioned, both might lose their efficacy and intended operation.....—(*b*) But, because Christ's exaltation was due to His humiliation, and the first step to that was His resurrection, because the Apostles were not qualified to preach repentance and remission of sins through His blood till He rose again, because the Spirit could not

---

356, 357. How was the distance of time between the death and resurrection of the Messias typified? 358, 359. Shew why it was requisite that *some* space of time, and yet *not* a *long* space, should intervene between Christ's death and resurrection.

be sent till He ascended, before which He must rise from the grave, therefore the space between His passion and resurrection could *not* be *long;* nor can any reason be assigned why His resurrection should be deferred when the verity of His death was sufficiently proved. Lest, therefore, His disciples should be long held in suspense, or any one after many days should doubt His identity,... He would not stay many days before He rose.

360. 2. *Particularly*, as the determinate space of *three days:* In "*the third day.*" This expression is capable of some diversity of interpretation. From Matt. xii. 40. "as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," it *seems* to follow (and some have conceived) that Christ's body was three whole days and three whole nights in the grave before He rose again. But this place, express as it seems, must be considered with the rest where the same truth is delivered. Compare "After three days I will rise again;" Matt. xxvii. 63; Mark viii. 31.—"Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up;" John ii. 19. and see Mark xiv. 58. But the most used phrase is that He "rose from the dead *the third day.*"—See many texts; *e.g.* Matt. xvi. 21; Luke ix. 22; I Cor. xv. 4.—and by *this* expression according to its constant usage in the language of the Greeks and Hebrews, those other, far less frequent, forms of speech must be interpreted. Now, according to the language of Scripture, if Christ were slain, and rose the third day, the day on which He died is *one*, the day on which He rose *another*, consequently there could be but *one day* and *two nights*

358, 360. Shew also what was the *determinate* space which did thus intervene; giving requisite quotations and illustrations.

between the day of His death and that of His resurrection.—[*Illustrations of what is meant by* "the third day," *or* "after three days."] *α.* When the male child *eight* days old was to be circumcised, the day of birth was one, of circumcision another, and so there were but *six complete* days between birth and circumcision. See Luke ii. 21. *β.* The day of Pentecost was the *fiftieth* from the day of the wave-offering, but in the number of the fifty days both the *day* of the *wave-offering* and *that* of *Pentecost* were *included*, (as among Christians the corresponding period from Easter to Whitsuntide is reckoned.) *γ.* "Joseph and His mother after three days found Him in the temple," *i.e.* the third day after He tarried behind in Jerusalem.—When we read that He was "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," we must not look on those *nights* as *distinct* from the *days*, but as "evening and morning" are used for a *day*, Gen. i. and similarly "2300 evenings and mornings," Dan. viii. 14. for so many days. (A night and a day in the Hebrew language, not used to compositions, is the same with the Greek *νυχθήμερον.*) The priests in their courses are said by the Jews to minister before the Lord *eight* days, whereas each course had but *seven* days' service, the sabbath on which they began, and that on which they went off, being both reckoned in the eight days; and so the day on which the Son of God died and was buried, and that on which He rose again, were included in the number of three days.—Thus our Saviour rose from the dead on "the third day" *properly*, and was "three days and three nights" in the heart of the earth *synecdochically*.

361. B. I. II. In respect of which was the precise *day* [how typified, and what day of the week,]

---

361. What things are to be considered in respect to the precise day on which Christ rose?

on which He rose; and III. of what belongs to that day in relation to His Resurrection.

362. I. The day on which the Messias was to rise was typified by that of the waved sheaf in the feast of first fruits:....."ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of the harvest unto the priest, and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it. And ye shall offer that day.....a he-lamb without blemish, &c." Lev. xxiii. 10., &c. All the fruits of the earth in Canaan were, under the Levitical Law, profane, and not to be eaten till consecrated, which they were in the feast of the first-fruits. One sheaf from the field was then *waved*, &c. before the Lord, and all the rest were holy by the acceptation of that. See Rom. xi. 16. This was always done the day after the sabbath, *i.e.* the Paschal solemnity, after which the fulness of harvest followed.—Thus was foretold and represented that as the sheaf was *waved*, &c., and the lamb *offered* on that day by the priest to God, so the promised Messias, that immaculate lamb..... that priest which dying was to offer up Himself... was this day to be lifted up, &c. from the dead, or rather to lift up and present Himself to God to be accepted for us all, that our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity. [*This paragraph has been transposed from its place in Pearson, for convenience of arrangement.*]

363. II. Jesus, our Messias, accordingly so ordered the time of His death as to rise on the day thus typified.—The particularity of *the third day* on which He rose is proved by two characters:

---

362. How was the day of His resurrection typified? 363, 364. On what day of the week did Christ rise? And how does it appear to have corresponded with the day typical of it? How are these points settled from considera-

364. 1. The description of *that* day in respect of which *this* is called the *third*, after the manner before shewn. *That* day on which our Saviour *died*, is often expressly called the *preparation*: *e. g.* They laid Jesus in the garden, "because of the Jews' *preparation*" day, &c. John xix. 42. "The next day that followed the *preparation*, the chief priests, &c." asked a guard. Matt. xxvii. 62. This preparation day was the day immediately before the sabbath or some other great feast of the Jews, and was so called because on it they prepared every thing needed for the celebration of the following festival, according to the command respecting the preparing the manna on the sixth day; Exod. xvi. 5. The day *now* considered was *both* "the preparation" to a *sabbath*,..."the day before the sabbath," Mark xv. 42..."the Sabbath drew on," Luke xxiii. 54. *and* "the preparation of the *passover*," John xix. 14. And further, "... that sabbath day [which *this* preparation preceded] was an high day;" xix. 31. *i. e.* not only a weekly sabbath, but a great festival, even a Paschal sabbath. Now the sabbath of the Jews being fixed to the *seventh* day of the week, the *preparation* or eve thereof must be the *sixth*, and the *third* from *it* the *eighth*, or *first* of the *next* week; [which on this occasion corresponded to the typical day in being the day on which the sheaf was waved, the day after the passover.]

365. 2. The expression of the time of the resurrection in the Evangelists. "When the sabbath was past, very early in the morning, the first day of the week;" Mark xvi. 1, 2. See the parallel pas-

---

tion of the day from which the resurrection day is reckoned the third? 365. How does the language of the evangelists expressing the time of Christ's resurrection shew on what day of the week, and at about what time of the day, it took place?

sages Matt. xxviii. 1 ; Luke xxiv. 1 ; John xx. 1. By all which it appears, that the body of Christ, being laid in the sepulchre on the preparation day, the eve of the Sabbath, and continuing there the whole sabbath, the conclusion of that week, and further resting there, dead, the night which followed that sabbath, but belonged to the *first* day of the next week, about the end of that night, early in the morning, was revived by the accession and union of His soul, and rose again out of the sepulchre.

366. III. Whereby the obligation of the day which was then the Sabbath died and was buried with Him, but in a manner by a diurnal transmutation revived at His resurrection.....*One day* of *seven* was set apart by God in imitation of His rest on the creation of the world, and *that seventh* day which was sanctified to the *Jews*, was reckoned in relation to their deliverance from Egypt, which *individual* reason is assigned, Deut. v. 15. for *their* observance of *their* Sabbath on *that* day, in addition to the *special* reason of their keeping a sabbath on a *seventh* day to shew that they worshipped the Creator of the world.—Since then on the resurrection of Christ a far greater deliverance was wrought than that from Egypt,.....the *individual* determination of the day passed on a stronger reason to another day, (—compare the change in the beginning of the *year* made by command of God on the coming out from Egypt ; Exod. xii. 2.—) always to be repeated by a seventhly return in reference to the creation. The *first* day is sanctified now as that on which

---

366. For what reason was the observation of a Sabbath on *one* day in *seven* enjoined? *What seventh* day of the week—and why ? -was enjoined as a sabbath to the *Jews?* Why is the *first* day now sanctified as *our* weekly sabbath instead of the day formerly enjoined to *them?*

Christ rose; and the seventh from that first for ever, because He who rose was the same God who created the world, ("by Him all things were created &c." Col. i. 16.) and rested on the seventh day.

367. This day the Apostles from the beginning religiously observed:.....*a.* The *first* observation was rather, providentially, by the design of God than by their own intention, when on the resurrection-day..."at evening, being the first day of the week, they were assembled for fear of the Jews;" John xx. 19.—*β.* the *second* voluntarily....."after eight days again His disciples were within, and Thomas" (absent on the previous occasion) "with them;" xx. 26.—*γ.* Again, on the day of Pentecost, which was the first day of the week, "they were all with one accord in one place," Acts ii. 1., received the promised Holy Ghost, &c.—The same practice continued; *δ.* "upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them;" Acts xx. 7.—*ε.* and "upon the first day of the week," he ordered, concerning the collection for the saints, writing to the Churches of Galatia and Corinth, "every one to lay by in store," &c. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.

368. From our Saviour's resurrection and the Apostles' constant practice this first day of the week came to be called the *Lord's day;* as Rev. i. 10. And thus the religious observance of *it* instead of the day which the Jews did sanctify, was transmitted to, and continued in, the Church of God.

---

367. Give instances from Scripture of the Apostles' practice in religiously observing the *first* day of the week.
368. What peculiar name has it received in Scripture in reference to our Lord?

369. This day thus consecrated by the resurrection of Christ was left as the perpetual badge of His Church. As God through Moses (Exod. xxxi. 13.) gave the sabbath to the *Jews* as a sign to distinguish them as worshippers of that God whose name is *Jehovah*, who made the world and delivered *them* from Pharaoh, so must we conceive that He hath given *us this* day as a sign between Him and us, whereby we may be known to worship the same God, Jehovah, who not only created heaven and earth, but raised His eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the Jews still celebrate the *seventh* day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance wrought than that from Egypt, as the Mahometans the *sixth*, in memory of the flight from Mecca of Mahomet, whom they esteem a greater prophet than our Saviour, as *these* are *thus* distinguished, so are *Christians* by observing the *first* day of the week, on which Christ rose from the dead.

Practical uses of Belief that Christ rose again from the Dead.

370. "Remember that Jesus Christ was raised from the the dead;" 2 Tim. ii. 8. This belief is necessary: (*a*) Because by His resurrection our faith, otherwise weak, is strong. In His death He assured us of His humanity. in His resurrection He proved His Divinity; "Crucified through weakness He yet liveth by the power of God;" 2 Cor. xiii. 4. "declared" thus when He rose "to be the Son of God," Rom. i. 4..... "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee;" Acts xiii. 33.—(*b*) Because we are thus assured of our justification: "if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus.....from the dead," it will be

---

369. How are *Christians* distinguished from *Jews* and *Mahometans* by their religious observance of the *first* day of the week? 370. What are the practical uses of belief

imputed to us "for righteousness:" for He "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification;" Rom. iv. 24, 25.....Dying for our sins, He rose to shew that He had made full satisfaction for them....."God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh," Rom. viii. 3. and raising up our surety from the grave did thus, manifestly acquitting and discharging Him from the whole obligation He had undertaken, acknowledge full satisfaction made for us....."It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again;" Rom. viii. 33, 34.--(*c*) For the grounding, confirming, &c. our hope. "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ..... hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, &c." 1 Pet. i. 3. By Christ's resurrection His Father hath been said to have begotten Him, and therefore by the same hath begotten us,.....brethren and co-heirs with Christ. "For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life;" Rom. v. 10.....He is "the first born from the dead," Col. i. 18. and we "the sons of the resurrection." By the Spirit of Christ abiding in us we are made members of Christ, and have a right to rise with our Head. "For if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in us;" Rom. viii. 11. Of our resurrection Christ's resurrection is i. an *efficient* cause; because He hath thereby obtained power and right to raise all the dead, "for as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive;" 1 Cor. xv. 22. ii. an *exemplary* cause....."for if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection;" Rom. vi. 5. "He shall change our vile bodies that they may be like unto His glorious body;" Phil. iii. 21. that "as we have borne the image of the earthy we may also bear the image of the heavenly;" 1 Cor. xv. 49.—(*d*) That His resurrection may work its

---

that Christ *rose again from the dead?* (*c*) In what two respects is His Resurrection a cause of ours? Quote texts throughout.

proper effect on our lives. "When we were dead in sins, God quickened us together with Christ;" Eph. ii. 5. "As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life; Rom. vi. 4 ....." Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light;" Eph. v. 14. There must be a spiritual resurrection of the soul before there can be a comfortable resurrection of the body.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. V. §. 2.

371. I believe as a certain and necessary truth that the eternal Son of God, who was crucified and died for our sins, did not long continue in the state of death, but by His infinite power did revive and raise Himself, by reuniting the same soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man, on the third day from His death; so that dying on Friday, the sixth day of the week, the day of preparation for the Sabbath, and resting in the grave the Sabbath day, on the morning of the first day of the week He returned to life again, and thereby consecrated that first day to a religious observation until His coming again. Thus I believe that THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD.

ART. VI. He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

§. 1. HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN.

372. The Person, *He*, being manifestly the same which we have already considered, it remains, as necessary for the illustration of Christ's Ascension,

373. I. To shew that the promised Messias should ascend into heaven. This was

374. 1. Represented typically. The High Priest, under the law an express type of the Messias,.....

---

371. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief that Christ *the third day rose again from the dead.* 372, 373, 376, 379. What things are required for the illustration of Christ's Ascension? 374. How was His Ascension typified?

for making the typical atonement representing the propitiation made by Christ for the sins of the world was to enter, himself, only, and only once in the year, into the Holy of Holies ; Lev. xvi. 2. thereby shewing that the "High Priest of good things to come, by a greater.....tabernacle,..... was to enter into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us;" Heb. ix. 11, 12. The Jews all believed that the Tabernacle signified this world, and the Holy of Holies the highest heavens : wherefore as the High Priest having slain the sacrifice passed with the blood thereof through the rest of the Tabernacle into the Holy of Holies, so the Messias, here offering up Himself, and slain, was to pass through the courts of this world below, and with His blood to enter the highest heavens.

375. 2. Declared prophetically. i. "Thou hast ascended up on high, Thou hast led captivity captive, and received gifts for men ;" Psal. lxviii. 18. "On high," in David's language signifying *heaven*, could apply to no conqueror but the Messias, (not Moses, David, &c.) who was to conquer sin and death and hell, and triumphing over them to ascend to the highest heaven, and thence to send the gifts of the Spirit to men.—ii. The Jews themselves confess that so much was foretold by Micah ; "The breaker is come up before them : they have broken up and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it ; and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord at the head of them ;" ii. 13.

376. II. To prove that Jesus, our Messias, accordingly did really ascend thither. That only-begotten Son of God, present by His

---

375. How prophetically declared ? 376, 377. What was this proper Ascension ? Quote texts throughout.

(ubiquitous) *Divinity* in the heavens while He was on earth, by a local translation of His *human* nature truly ascended from this earth below into the heavens above, in the same body and soul with which He lived, and died, and rose again.

377. This Ascent was *not figurative*, as if signifying only that He obtained a more glorious state after His resurrection. For whatever alteration, by addition of whatever glorious qualities, was made to the body of Christ when He rose, was *not* His *Ascension:* "Touch me not," said He to Mary, "for I am not yet ascended to My Father;" John xx. 17.—And though He had said before to Nicodemus, "No man ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven," iii. 13. yet those words relate not to *this* ascension, are only thus true, because the Son of man when not yet conceived in the Virgin's womb, was not in heaven, and after His conception by virtue of the *hypostatical* union *was* in heaven; whence speaking after the manner of men He might well say He had ascended into heaven..... Another and more proper Ascension therefore yet remained...—Now this kind of Ascension by which Christ had not yet ascended when He spake to Mary after His resurrection, was not long after to be performed; for at the same time He said to her "Go to my brethren, and say..... I ascend unto My Father and your Father;" And when this Ascension was performed, it

---

377. Shew that the Ascension now considered cannot be understood figuratively, of any change in His body consequent on His resurrection. In what sense only could it be truly said that Christ had before ascended into heaven? Shew that Christ's more proper Ascension was to be performed not long after His resurrection.

appeared manifestly to be a true local translation of the Son of man as *man* from earth to heaven, by which His body, (living after His resurrection by virtue of the soul united to it,) before locally present on earth, and not so in heaven, became substantially present in heaven, no longer locally present on earth. For when.....laying His hands on the disciples (and so corporally present with them), He had blessed them, "while He blessed them, He was parted from them and while they beheld He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight," and so He was "carried up into heaven, while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as He went up:" Luke xxiv. 50, 51; Acts i. 9, 10...

378. This Ascension is testified, (*a*) By the eye-witness of the Apostles (as just related).....An eye-witness was not necessary to His *resurrection:* that He "shewed Himself" to the Apostles "alive after His passion" Acts i. 3. demonstrated that He *had* risen. But since they were not to see the *effect* of His Ascension, His *session in heaven*, it was necessary that they should be eye-witnesses of the act itself.—(*b*) Also by the testimony of angels; who coming down from heaven knew that Christ had ascended unto the place whence they came, and because the eyes of the Apostles could not follow Him so far, came to testify of His reception, thus, ".....Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven;" Acts i. 10, 11.

---

378. What are the testimonies to Christ's Ascension? What difference existed, and why? as to the necessity of an eye-witness of Christ's *resurrection*, and of His *Ascension?*

379. III. To enquire what is here meant by "Heaven," the name having divers senses in the Scriptures.....In some sense Christ was in heaven before the cloud took Him out of the Apostles' sight—the *clouds* are called the "clouds of heaven;" but that heaven is the *first*, and our Saviour certainly ascended at least as far as St Paul was caught up, into the *third* heaven. "We have a great High Priest that is *passed through* (διεληλυθότα—*see Pearson's note*) the heavens," Heb. iv. 14.—"made higher than the heavens," vii. 26. Christ then is ascended through and above the heavens, and yet is still in heaven, for He is "entered into that within the vail," vi. 19.—there is His passage through the heavens—"into the holy place, even into heaven itself to appear in the presence of God," ix. 12, 24.—this is the heaven of heavens. As Christ descended unto the earth "the footstool" of His Father, in His humiliation, so He ascended unto heaven "the throne" of His Father, in His exaltation. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?" John vi. 62. Had He been there before in body, His ascent thither again had been no such wonder; but that His body should ascend to that place where the Majesty of God was most resplendent, that the flesh of our flesh should be seated far above all angels, &c. at the right hand of God, this was what Christ propounded as worthy of their greatest admiration. Whatsoever heaven then is higher than all the rest called heavens,...into that place did He ascend in His *humanity* where in the splendour of His Deity He was before He took our humanity upon Him.....

---

379. Shew, quoting requisite texts, what is meant by that heaven into which Christ ascended.

Practical uses of Belief that Christ Ascended into Heaven.

380. This belief is necessary: (*a*) i. For the *confirmation* of our *faith*, in that we believe in Him who is received unto the Father, and therefore certainly came from the Father; are assured that He was His messenger to us, because He was therefore so highly rewarded by Him that sent Him.—ii. For the *exaltation* of our *faith*, as being the "evidence of things not seen." Heb. xi. 1.; Christ said to Thomas....."Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." John xx. 29.; a blessedness by His Ascension left to the whole Church.....i. His Ascent is the *cause*, ii. His [consequent] absence the *crown* of our *faith*...—(*b*) For the corroboration of our *hope*.....Where He, our Head, is, the members may expect admission....."There are many mansions in His Father's house;" John xiv. 2. And when He spake of ascending thither, He said to His disciples, "I go to pre pare a place for you, and will come again, and receive you unto Myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." The first fruits of our nature are ascended, and the rest is sanctified. This is the "new and living way which He hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, His flesh," Heb. x. 20. And hence we "have our hope as an anchor of the soul,.....which entereth into that within the vail, whither the forerunner for us is entered;" Heb. vi. 19, 20. Christ in His Ascension the *forerunner*—therefore there are *some* to *follow*, by the same way to the same place;—entered for *us*—therefore *we* are to follow and overtake Him there; as.....branches of the same vine, &c.) πρόδρομος including also a notion of *first fruits*, come to perfection before the rest—(*see note in Pearson.*) As "God hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together" by virtue of His resurrection, so hath He also "made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus," Eph. ii. 5, 6. by virtue of His Ascension—already seated there *in* Him, hereafter to be seated *by* Him...—(*c*) For the *exaltation* of our *affections*. "Where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also;" Matt. vi. 21. If Christ's

---

380. What are the practical uses of belief that Christ *Ascended into Heaven?* Quote texts throughout.

words, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me," John xii. 32, be true of His crucifixion, how powerfully should they apply to His Ascension? ....."If we be risen with Christ, we must seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God;" Col. iii. 1. &c. "must set our affections on things above, not on things on the earth," Christ is ascended into heaven to teach us that we are "strangers and pilgrims" here.....and as such should learn to "abstain from fleshly lusts," 1 Pet. ii. 11. and not "mind earthly things," as being "citizens of heaven, whence we look for the Saviour, &c." Phil. iii. 19, 20....—(*d*) In respect of the *great effects* immediately consequent on Christ's Ascension. The Apostles had never preached the Gospel, and infallibly declared the truths which we as Christians believe, unless endued with power from above, which they could not receive but by the descent of the Holy Ghost, who had not descended except our Saviour had ascended first:....."If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send Him unto you;" John xvi. 7.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. VI. §. 1.

381. I am fully persuaded that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, after He rose from the dead, did with the same soul and body with which He rose, by a true local translation convey Himself from earth through all the regions of the air, all the celestial orbs, till he came unto the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the Majesty of God. Thus I believe in Jesus Christ, who ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN.

ART. VI. §. 2. AND SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY.

382. The preceding part of this Article has not been varied: In this the ancients had only..... "sitteth at the right hand of the Father:" It contains

---

381. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief that Christ *Ascended into Heaven.* 382. How was the latter part of Article VI. stated by the ancients?

383. Particular I. The Session of Christ: for the explication of which it will be necessary

384. I. To prove that the promised Messias was to sit at the right hand of God. This was

385. I. Pretypified. *Joseph*, in many things a type of Christ, was especially so in that being taken out of prison he was exalted to the supreme power of Egypt. For thus Pharaoh spake to Joseph, "Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled; only in the throne will I be greater than thou, &c. &c. and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt;" Gen. xli. 40., &c.....A clear representation of the Son of man, who by His sitting on the right hand of God obtained power to rule all things both in heaven and earth, (especially as the "*ruler of His house*," that is, the Church,)..... but all this in the name of the Father, to whom the throne is still reserved, &c.

386. 2. Expressly foretold. "The Lord said unto my Lord," saith David, "Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool;" Psal. cx. 1. The Jews have vainly attempted to evade this, some making the person addressed to be Hezekiah, some Abraham, some Zorobabel, some David, others the people of Israel: and because the prophecy cannot belong to the author of the psalm, the *authorship* is by those who expound the prophecy of Abraham assigned to Eleazar his steward, by those who expound the prophecy of David, to one of his musicians.—But (*a*) David certainly was the writer of this Psalm; for it is entitled, "A psalm of David," (it is vainly

---

383, 384, 387, 389. What is required for the explication of the Session of Christ? 385. How was the sitting of the Messias at the right hand of God pretypified? 386. How expressly foretold? Refute Jewish misapplications of the prophecy.

objected that it signifies a psalm *for* David,) whence the prediction could not belong to *him*, being spoken of *his Lord*:—(*b*) A character suiting none of the rest whom the Jews imagine.—(*c*) Beside, the person so said to "*sit*, &c." is called "a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedech," which also suits none of them.—(*d*) Again, our Saviour urged this very Scripture against the Pharisees, "saying, what think ye of Christ? &c. &c. If David then call Him Lord, how is He his Son? And no man was able to answer Him a word;" Matt. xxii. 42., &c. whence it is evident that the Jews of old, even the most skilful of them, the Pharisees, (since they denied not our Saviour's application,) *did* interpret that Psalm of the Messias, as indeed divers Rabbins have interpreted it since.

387. II. To shew that Jesus, our Messias, is accordingly so set down at the right hand of God.

388. His ascension was the way to His session; His session the end of His ascension. "He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God;" Mark xvi. 19. God "raised" Christ "from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places;" Eph. i. 20..... "*David* is *not* ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The Lord said unto *My Lord, Sit Thou*, &c. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath" (not set at His right hand Abraham, nor David, &c. but) "made that same Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ;" Acts ii. 34., &c.—This was an honour *never* given nor promised to any *man but* the *Messias*:.....And "to which of His *angels*

---

388. Shew, quoting requisite texts, that Jesus did accordingly so sit down. Can the same be predicated of any

(though they *stand* about the throne of God) said God at any time, *Sit* thou, &c." Heb. i. 13. But Christ was so fully assured of this honour that before His enemies, in the prospect of death, He declared, "Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God;" Luke xxii. 69.—Thus is our "Jesus gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God;" 1 Pet. iii. 22.

389. III. To enquire the full meaning of that phrase, and how it is applicable to Christ.

390. I. "On the right hand of God." God....a Spirit.....hath no body,.....and so *properly* no hands; but in condescension to our capacity..... He expresses that which is in Him by some analogy with that which belongs to us.—(*a*) i. The hands of man are those organical parts which are most active and executive of our power;.....whence the *power* of God, or the execution thereof, is signified by the *hand* of God; and ii. the *infinite greatness* of His power by the *right* hand of God, because, by a general custom of the world, the right hand is more used, and becomes thereby stronger than the left.—(*b*) The most *honourable* place among men is the right hand; Bathsheba sat on the right hand of her son king Solomon; 1 Kings ii. 19. Therefore the *right hand of God* signifies His glorious *Majesty*.—(*c*) Because the *gifts* of *men* are given and received by their *hands*, and every *perfect gift* comes from the "*Father* of lights," therefore the *right hand of God* is the place of celestial and *perfect felicity*....."At Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore;" Psal. xvi. 11.

391. Correspondently, Christ is said to sit *on the right hand of God;* In regard to (*a*) That *absolute*

---

other, man or angel? 390. "On the right hand of God." Shew what is meant by the expression. 391. Shew that

power which He had obtained in heaven; "Hereafter ye shall see the son of man sitting on the right hand of power;" Matt xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69. -(*b*) That *honour and majesty* which He hath obtained there....."He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;" Heb. i. 3...." is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens;" viii. i.—(*c*) His *resting* above in unspeakable and everlasting *felicity*, after His sufferings and death.

392. 2. "He sitteth..." This must *not* be taken *literally*, as determining any *posture* of His body in the heavens. We find in Scripture a more general term applied to His presence in heaven; "Who is even at the right hand of God;" Rom. viii. 34. So 1 Pet. iii. 22. He is also expressed as *standing* on the right hand of God, Acts vii. 56. so appearing to Stephen, as ready to assist, plead for, receive him: He is oftener expressed *sitting*, not for any positional variation, but for the variety of His operation.—(*a*) To *sit* then may signify no more than *habitation and continuance*, as the same word in Hebrew and Greek often signifies.—(*b*) It implies also *rest and indisturbance*; "They shall sit every man under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid;" Mic. iv. 4.—(*c*) *Dominion and majesty*; as when Solomon "sat" in the throne of his father, he reigned over Israel after his death. 1 Kings ii. 12.—(*d*) Yet more properly and peculiarly *the right of judicature*:... "a king that sitteth in the throne of judgment;" Prov. xx. 8. "In mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth..... judging, &c." Isai. xvi. 5.

Christ's Session *on the right hand of God* corresponds in all respects to the meaning. 392. "He sitteth:" What is meant by this expression?

393. Correspondently, Christ is said to *sit* on the right hand of God ; (*a*) Because He which dwelt before with us on earth hath now taken his *habitation* in heaven.—(*b*) Because He there *rests* from all sorrow and disturbance.—(*c*) Because in regard of *dominion* "set down at the right hand of the throne of God." St Paul well interprets "Sit Thou, &c." saying, "He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet ;" 1 Cor. xv. 25.—(*d*) Because manifestly so declared the *great judge* of quick and dead.

394. 3. Having ascertained the import of the *language*, we find the substance of the *doctrine* to be that sitting on the right hand of God was our Mediator's *solemn entry* on His *Regal office*, as to the execution of the full dominion due to Him. For "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, &c." Rev. v. 12. Wherefore Christ after His death and resurrection saith, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth ;" Matt. xxviii. 18. See Phil. ii. 8., &c. and Eph. i. 20., &c. [*referred to, par.* 196.]

395. There was an express promise made by God to David, "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee ; thy throne shall be established for ever ;" 2 Sam. vii. 16. This promise *literally* taken was but *conditional:* the condition is elsewhere expressed,..."If thy children will keep my covenant, &c. their children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore ;" Psal. cxxxii. 12. Notwithstanding this promise this kingdom of David was intercepted, nor was

---

393. Shew that *Christ's Session* on the right hand of God corresponds in all respects to that meaning. 394. What is the substance of the doctrine conveyed in the phrase of Christ's "sitting on the right hand of God?" 395. What promise was made by God to David of the continuance of his kingdom ? On what condition did the

his family continued on the throne :.....yet we cannot say the promise was not made good ; it only ceased to be obligatory because the condition was not performed—...

396. But yet in a larger and better sense...the throne of David was continued. When His posterity had sinned and lost their right to the crown, the kingdom was to be given to Him who never sinned, and consequently could never lose it ; and He being of the seed of David, in Him the throne of David was without interruption or succession continued. See Luke i. 32, 33. and Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24. [*as quoted, &c. par.* 197.]

397. Now as David i. was designed and anointed king seven years before he had any possession of the crown, and ii. then, again anointed, reigned as king at first only over Judah, in Hebron, afterwards over all Israel, in Jerusalem, so Christ i. was born king of the Jews, and the conjunction of His human nature with His Divine...was a sufficient unction to His Regal office ; yet as the Son of man He exercised no such dominion, professing that His "kingdom was not of this world," John xviii. 36. but ii. after He rose from the dead, then, as in Hebron with His own tribe, He tells the Apostles, "all power is given unto Him," and thereon gives them injunctions ; and at His Ascension He enters the Jerusalem above, and there sits down on the right hand of the throne of God, and so makes a solemn entry on the entire dominion over all things : then could St Peter say....."God hath made...Jesus...both Lord and Christ ;" Acts ii. 36.

---

fulfilment of it depend ? And why was it *not literally* fulfilled ? 396. In what, highest, sense was it completely fulfilled ? 397. From different times of David's anointings and accessions of power illustrate Christ's entrance after divers gradations on full and entire dominion.

398. The immediate effect of this Regal power, the proper execution of this office, is the subduing of all His enemies: He is "set down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool;" Heb. x. 12, 13. An allusion to the ancient custom of Oriental conquerors; Joshua desired his men of war to put their feet on the necks of the five captured kings; Josh. x. 24.—The enemies of Christ are

399. (*a*) *Temporal:* such as visibly and actually oppose Him and His Apostles and the believers in His name. Especially i. the Jews, who rejected ...and crucified Him, afterwards persecuted His disciples, tried all means to hinder the spread of Christianity. They accordingly were "made His footstool," destroyed by ii. The Romans, who had complied with them in Christ's crucifixion, and afterwards in defence of their heathen deities endeavoured by persecution to extirpate Christianity. These were next to be made the footstool of the king of kings, which they were when Rome was taken and sacked, &c. and when the whole Roman empire became Christian. iii. In the same manner whatsoever persons and nations openly oppose the name of Christ are His enemies, in due time to be subdued under Him, and, when He calleth, to be slain.

400. (*b*) *Spiritual:* such as invisibly oppose Christ's dominion, Sin, Satan, Death; every one of which has a kingdom of its own, opposed to that of Christ. i. "*Sin* hath reigned unto death;" "Let

---

398. What is the immediate effect of His Regal power? What Oriental custom is referred to under the image of His making His foes His footstool? 399. Who are the *temporal* enemies of Christ? Who have especially been so? And how made His footstool? 400. Who are the *spiritual* enemies of Christ? [*Wicked men*—see par. 135.,

not sin reign in your mortal body ;" Rom. v. 21 ; vi. 12. in opposition to the immaculate Lamb of God ;—ii. *Satan* is "the Prince of this world ;" John xiv. 30. "The spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience is the Prince of the power of the air ;" Eph. ii. 2. and thus "the rulers of the darkness of this world" Eph. vi. 12. oppose "the true Light of the world."—iii. *Death* "by one offence reigned by one," Rom. v. 17. in opposition to "the Prince of Life."

401. .....Christ by His Regal office subdues and destroys all these [spiritual enemies.....He shall "put down all rule, &c." 1 Cor. xv. 24. but this amounts *not* so much to a *total destruction* as to an *absolute subjection* ;.....He will "subdue all things unto Himself ;" Phil. iii. 21. The principal end of His Regal office is the redemption and salvation of all those whom God had given Him ; and whatsoever opposeth *their* salvation is thereby His enemy ; His enemy so far and no further ; therefore to be *destroyed so far*, but *further* than that *not destroyed* but *subdued* ; whatsoever hindereth the bringing in of His own into His kingdom is for the demonstration of God's *mercy abolished*, but whatsoever may yet be subservient to the demonstration of His *justice* is *continued*. Thus

402. Christ as King, sitting on the right hand of God, *destroys*, in respect of all those who belong to His kingdom, i. the power of *Sin*, taking away its guilt by His death, its dominion by His actual grace, its spot by grace habitual. ii. ..."Him

---

which compare with this and the preceding, — are not here formally mentioned by Pearson.] 401. Distinguish between the *total destruction* and the *absolute subjection* of Christ's spiritual enemies. 402. With respect to whom are these His enemies *destroyed ?* Instance in each particular enemy.

that had the power of death, that is, *the Devil,*" Heb. ii. 14. by virtue of His death perpetually represented to the Father. He frees the elect of God here from the power of Satan by His grace, hereafter from possibility of infernal opposition by His glory. In them He prevents the "wiles," destroys the "works," them He takes out of the "snare," preserves from the "condemnation, of the Devil." See Eph. vi. 11; 1 John iii. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 6.—iii. *Death* itself, "the last enemy that shall be destroyed;" 1 Cor. xv. 26. "He will ransom" His redeemed "from the power of the grave, &c." Hos. xiii. 14... and when at the general resurrection of all the sons of men Death shall be "swallowed up in victory," 1 Cor. xv. 54. the sons of God shall be made completely and eternally happy both in body and soul.

403. But, on the other hand, in the reprobate and damned persons, i. The spot,—the dominion,—the guilt, ever obliging them to eternal pains,—of *sin*, continue; but all this in subjection to Christ's throne, for the glory of which rebellion is punished.—ii. They are still slaves to the powers of hell, and by them to be tormented for ever; thus is the power of *Satan* left subservient to the demonstration of Divine justice.—iii. They rise again indeed to life, from the *first* death, but that life is a *second* and far worse *death.*

404. The Regal power of Christ,—thus set down at the right hand of God that He might subdue all things to Himself, — as a branch of the Mediatorship is to continue till all His enemies

---

403. With respect to whom are they *continued* in operation, and *not destroyed*, though *subdued* to Christ?
404. How long shall Christ's Regal power in His Mediatorial capacity continue? When and wherefore will His Mediatorial office, in all its branches, cease? What

be subdued ;.....and when all His enemies shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into His kingdom, when those who refused Him to rule over them shall be slain, *i. e.* when the whole office of the Mediator shall be completed and fulfilled, then every branch of the execution shall cease :...The beatifical vision shall succeed Christ's *instructions* of us as a *Prophet;* present fruition will prevent His *oblation* and *intercession* as a *Priest;* perfect security will need no further act of His *Kingly* power to defend and protect us.....Yet shall not Christ cease to be a king : "We shall reign with Him" 2 Tim. ii. 12. for ever.....He shall eternally retain all the power and honour due to Him as a reward for His sufferings, or consequent on the union of His humanity with His Divinity..... "He shall reign for ever and ever;" Rev. xi. 15... Lest we should imagine otherwise, or interpret this Article as if after the day of Judgement Christ were to be removed from the right hand of God, the ancient fathers added to the Nicene Creed, "Whose kingdom shall have no end;" against the heresy which then arose denying the eternity of it.—[*See, partly to avoid repetitions, par.* 197. *former part; and in addition to the texts there quoted see* Heb. ii. 8. and x. 12, 13.]

Pratical uses of Belief in Christ as sitting on the right hand of God.

405. This belief is necessary: (*a*) To remind us of our *duty* of obedience.....The majesty of a king claims the loyalty of a subject, and if we acknowledge His authority we must submit to His power.....The nature of His

---

clause was added to the Nicene Creed, and why? respecting the eternity of Christ's kingdom? Shew in what respects He will nevertheless be a King for ever. 405. What are the practical uses of belief in *Christ* as *sitting on the right hand of God?*

government strongly incites to obedience. Subject we *must* be,...but if *willingly*, then is our service perfect freedom; if *unwillingly*, then is our averseness everlasting misery. Enemies we all have been; under His feet we shall either be *adopted* or *subdued*...—(*b*) To assure us of *protection* under His dominion. God by this exaltation hath given Christ to be "the Head over all things to the church;" Eph. i. 22. therefore from Him we may expect direction and preservation..... "Head" implies not only *dominion* but *union;* While we look on Him at the right hand of God, we see ourselves in heaven ....."To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with My Father in His throne;" Rev. iii. 21.....—(*c*) In respect of the immediate consequence of His glorious Session,—His *Intercession.* He is ascended as the true Melchizedech, not only as "King of Salem," the Prince of Peace, but as "the Priest of the most High God;" Heb. vii. 1. And whereas every Priest according to the Law of Moses "stood daily ministering, &c. this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, [*Pearson's punctuation,*] sat down on the right hand of God;" Heb. x. 11, 12. Though the sacrifice be but once offered, the virtue of it is perpetually advanced by His passion. For He "is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us," Heb. ix. 24.—"an Advocate with the Father,"...1 John ii. 1.—"able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them;" Heb. vii. 25. "Who" then "shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?.....It is Christ,.....who is even at the right hand of God, who.....maketh intercession for us;" Rom. viii. 33, 34.

406. Particular II. The description of Him on whose right hand Christ sitteth: which seems delivered in the same terms as were used in Art. I.; "God the Father Almighty." And indeed it is the same name of the same *God*, the same name of the same *Father*;.....these terms therefore require not here to be again considered

---

406. "God the Father Almighty." Why does the attribute *Almighty* require to be here considered, and *not* the nature of *God*, *nor* relation of *Father*?

with respect to the nature of *God*, and the relation of *Father:* but because there is a difference in the Greek between the word rendered *Almighty* in Art. I. (παντοκράτωρ), and the word so rendered here (παντοδύναμος), the former more properly signifying *authority of dominion*, the latter more properly *power in operation*, *this* notion of Omnipotency has been reserved to be *now* explained.

407. In which two things are observable; the *propriety* in the *potency*, the *universality* in the *omnipotency*. The *potency* consists in a proper, innate.....force or activity, by which God is able to work and produce real effects, which require a real power to their production: in which respect He is often described as a *mighty* God. The *omnipotency* consists in an ability to act and produce whatsoever can be acted and produced, without possibility of impediment or resistance: in which respect He is represented to us as truly and properly an *Almighty* God....."With God nothing shall be impossible;" Luke i. 37..... "with God all things are possible;" Mark x. 27.

408. 1. We must call God *Omnipotent*, because all power whatsoever in any creature is derived from Him.....There is nothing in the universe but hath *some* kind of *activity*, and consequently *some* power to *act*;.....and as *all* their *entities* flow from the *first of beings*, so do all their various *powers* from *the first of powers*; and as *all* their *beings* cannot be conceived to depend of any but an *infinite essence*, so *all those powers* cannot proceed from any but an *infinite power*.

---

407. Define the *potency*, and further the *omnipotency*, signified here by this term. 408. Explain how God is to be called *Omnipotent* in regard of power derived from Him.

409. 2. God may be called *Omnipotent*, because there can be no resistance made to His power, no opposition to His will..."The Lord of Hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it;....." Isai. xiv. 27. "He doth according to His will,... none can stay His hand, &c." Dan. iv. 35. According to the degrees of power in the Agent and Resistant is an action performed, hindered, or prevented.....If there be *no* degree of power in the *Resistant in reference to the Agent*, then is the action *totally vigorous;* and if in all the powers beside that of God there be not the least degree of resistance, His power must be *infinite*. "In thine hand, O God, is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand Thee?" 2 Chron. xx. 6. Hence there is no difficulty with God to perform (or create) any thing.....but an equal facility in reference to all things, which cannot be imagined but by an infinite excess of power beyond all resistance.

410. 3. God is yet more properly called *Omnipotent*, because His own active power extends itself to all things, nor is there any thing imaginably possible which He cannot do..."I know that Thou canst do every thing;" Job xlii. 1, 2.....His power is infinite *extensively*, in respect of its *object*, i. e. *all things;* for whatsoever effects there be of His power, more can be produced;—*intensively*, in respect of the *action*, or perfection of the effect produced; for whatsoever addition of perfection is possible is within His omnipotency. The object then of His power is whatsoever is simply and absolutely *possible*, in itself such that it *may be;* and *so* possible is every thing which does not

---

409. How in regard of inability in any thing to resist Him. 410. How, yet more properly, in regard to the infinite extent of His power, both as to the object and the effects of it. When is a thing said to imply a contradiction? What things only are absolutely impossible, and wherefore consequently not within the power of God?

imply a contradiction. Again, whatsoever implies a contradiction is *impossible.* For that is said to imply a contradiction, which if it were, it would necessarily follow that the same thing would be and not be, at the same time and in the same respect, which is impossible, and consequently not within the power of God, because *impossibility* is a *contradiction of all power*.....

411. (*a*) In respect of the *object*, That doth imply a contradiction *α. Immediately*, which plainly and in terms signifies a repugnancy, and so destroys itself; *e. g.* as for the same thing to be and not to be. *β. Consequentially*, when in appearance seeming not impossible, yet by necessary consequence, if admitted, it leads to a contradiction; *e. g.* that one body should at the same time be in two distinct places speaks no repugnancy in terms, yet by consequence leads to that which is repugnant in itself, *i. e.* that the same body is *but one*, and *not but one*, body. Confessedly it is not in the power of God to effect that which in either of these ways involves a contradiction: but that is no derogation to His power, because not within the object of *any* power. And He may certainly *have all* power who *hath not* that which *belongs to no* power.

412. (*b*) In respect of the *Agent*, That doth imply a contradiction which is repugnant to His essential perfection; for since every action flows from the essence of the agent, whatsoever is totally repugnant to that essence must involve a contradiction as to the agent; *e. g.* God cannot sleep, want, die; being essentially spiritual, all-

---

411. In what ways may an action imply a contradiction in respect of the *object*? Shew that it is not derogatory to the Omnipotency of God that He *cannot* effect *such* an action. 412. How may an action imply a contradiction in respect of the *Agent*? Shew that it is not derogatory to the Omnipotency of God that He *cannot* effect *such* an action.

sufficient, existent. Nor can that be a diminution of His Omnipotency, the contrary whereof would be a proof of His impotency. Thus it is *impossible* for *God* to *lie*—because a lie is *repugnant* to the perfection of *veracity*, which is essential to God as necessarily following from His *infinite knowledge*, which cannot be deceived, and His *infinite sanctity*, which cannot deceive...It being therefore manifestly contradictory to say that God can lie, it is no derogation from His omnipotency that He cannot. Whatsoever God cannot do...only shews that the rest of His attributes and perfections are as essential to Him as his power, and as His power suffers no resistance, so the rest of His perfections admit no repugnance...*

413. Thus God is *Omnipotent*, and *God only*. For if the power of all things beside God be the power of God, as derived from, and subordinate to, Him, and His own power can be subordinate to none, none can be omnipotent but God.

414. Again, we say God the *Father* is *Almighty*, because He is God, but *not* that the *Father only* is *Almighty*, because it is not true that He only is God.....The Father, the *Son*, (as already proved,) and the *Holy Ghost*, (as will hereafter be shewn,) are *God* by the *same Divinity*, therefore *Omnipotent* by the *same Omnipotency*. The *Father* then is here called *Almighty*—not by way of exclusion, but because the power of God answereth particularly to the right hand of God, "the right hand of power;" and accordingly—to shew that Christ having ascended into heaven, and being set down at the right hand of God, is invested with a greater power than He exercised

---

413. Shew that *God only* is Omnipotent. 414. Shew that the attribute *Almighty* is not confined to the *Father only*. Why is He here peculiarly so described?

* The Omnipotency of God is confessed by the best and oldest of the heathen authors, *e.g.* Homer, Pythagoras, Virgil, &c., though denied by some others, whose futile arguments are briefly touched by Plutarch, more largely delivered by Pliny. *See notes in Pearson.*

before, even with "all power," which in the ultimate extent of its infinity is "given" to Him who is set down on the right hand of Him who is God the Father, and being so is therefore *Almighty.*

Practical uses of Belief in God Almighty.

415. This belief is necessary: (*a*) To beget the fear and obedience due to His infinite Majesty. Our God is "a great God, a mighty, and (therefore) a terrible;" Deut. x. 17....."Fear Him which after He hath killed hath power to cast into hell, &c." Luke xii. 5....."I am the Almighty God, walk before Me, and be thou perfect;" Gen. xvii. 1....."Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, &c." 1 Pet. v. 6...He is the "One Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy;" James iv. 12.—(*b*) As the foundation of our faith. All the miracles which have been seen were wrought that we should believe, and never had miracle been seen if God were not Omnipotent. The objects of our faith are beyond all *finite* power...but...what can God propound to us which we cannot assent to, if we can believe that He is Omnipotent? (*c*) In respect of active and operative reliance on the promises of God. Such was the confidence of Abraham, the Father of the faithful, who "....was strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform;" Rom. iv. 20, 21. The promises of God are firm and sure because He (unlike men [*see similar contrast as to testimony, par.* 8.]) being of *infinite sanctity cannot intend* by *breaking* them to deceive us, and being also of *infinite power* must be *able* to *perform* them....."I know whom I have believed," every good Christian may say, "and I am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day;" 2 Tim. i. 12....."My Father," saith Christ, "which gave them (My sheep) Me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of My Father's hand;" John x. 29.—(*d*) To give life to our devotions. We ask from heaven things which none but God can give, many such as God if not Almighty could not effect. Therefore in the form of prayer taught us by Christ we

---

415. What are the practical uses of belief in God *Almighty?* Quote texts.

conclude our petitions to the Father thus, "For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, &c." Matt. vi. 13...He "is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think;" Eph. iii. 20.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. VI. §. 2.

416. I assent to this as a most certain truth, that Jesus Christ, ascending into the highest heavens after all His sufferings endured for our redemption, did rest in everlasting happiness...did take up a perpetual habitation there, and sit down on the throne of God as a Judge and as a King—according to His office of Mediator, unto the end of the world;—according to what He merited by His Mediatorship, to all eternity:—"the right hand of God the Father Almighty" signifying an Almighty power, able to do all things without limitation, so they involve not a contradiction either in themselves or in relation to His perfections. Thus I believe in Jesus Christ who SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY.

ART. VII. From thence He shall come to Judge the Quick and the Dead.

417. Particular 1. *Christ*, who is gone from us, *shall come again.* For the illustration of which it will be necessary

418. I. To shew that the promised Messias was to come again after He once was come. This was certainly and copiously foretold in Scripture, wherein as when we read of His griefs and humility we are admonished of His coming to suffer, so when we read of His power and glory we are assured of His coming to judge. We must not fancy with the Jews a double Messias, [*see pars.* 120, 238, 239.] but take for a truth what they have made an occasion of their error, *i. e.*

---

416. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in *Jesus Christ* who *sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.* 417, 418. In illustration of the future coming of Christ, shew that such a coming of the promised Messias was foretold in Scripture. Confute a

that the Messias is twice to come....Particularly, "Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied" of this (second) Advent, "saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of His angels;" (*angels* in Pearson—*see orig.*) Jude 14. And more particularly Daniel,....."I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, &c. and there was given Him dominion, &c. that all people, &c. should serve Him: &c." vii. 13, 14. This Son of man the Jews confess to be the Messias,...but evacuate the prediction by a false interpretation, saying that if the Jews went on in their sins, then the Messias should come in humility, "lowly and riding upon an ass," Zech. ix. 9. but if they pleased God, then He should come in glory, "with the clouds of heaven." But these two descriptions are two several predictions, and must *both* be fulfilled :... Christ is already come according to the first, therefore shall come according to the second.

419. II. To declare how we are assured that Jesus, already proved to have once come as the true Messias, shall come the second time. Angels testified, "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, &c." Acts i. 11. Christ promised, "If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you to Myself, &c." John xiv. 3. *and see* 28. He it is which from the beginning was to *come*...the name *Shiloh*—see Gen. xlix. 10.—was obscure, but the added notion of the *comer* most vulgar: according to which notion He once came; and keeps it still; He is to come again. "For yet a little while, and He that shall come will come;" Heb. x. 37. Our Jesus shall come...as the Messias

---

Jewish misinterpretation of a remarkable prophecy to this purpose. 419. Shew how we are assured that our Jesus shall accordingly so come. Quote texts.

was foretold, as "the Son of man coming in His kingdom;" Matt. xvi. 28....."He cometh *with clouds*, &c." Rev. i. 7. according to the prophetic vision:—Those clouds were anciently expounded by the Jews of the glorious attendance of angels, and with such attendance do we expect the coming of Jesus, as He hath taught us, "in the glory of His Father with His angels;" Matt. xvi. 27.

420. Particular 2. *From thence:*.....that is, from and out of the highest heaven, where, having thither "ascended," He now "sitteth on the right hand of God," shall Christ come. "Him must the heaven receive till the time of the restitution of all things," Acts iii. 21, and then "The Lord Himself shall descend from heaven, &c." 1 Thess. iv. 16. "Our conversation" ought to be "in heaven," because from thence "we look for our Saviour the Lord Jesus;" Phil. iii. 20. Our High Priest is gone up into the Holy of Holies not made with hands, there to make atonement for us, and as the people of Israel awaited without the tabernacle the return of Aaron, so must we expect....."when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, &c." 2 Thess. i. 7. "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven;" Matt. xxvi. 64. Thus shall He come, from the right hand of power, in fulness of majesty; from the highest heavens, a demonstration of His sanctity;...thus appearing most fit

421. Particular 3. *To judge...*: For the explication of which action it will be necessary to consider

422. I. How we may be assured that there is a judgment to come, that *any one* "shall come to

---

420. Whence shall He so come? (Quote texts.) How therefore appearing most fit for the office of judging? 421, 422, 425, 432. "To judge..." What things are necessary to be considered for the explication of this particular?

judge." This appears demonstrable, when we consider

423. 1. *Ourselves:*...There is in the soul of every man a *conscience*, which gives testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what to do. The subsequent or reflective conscience warns us what we are to receive. Looking back on the actions we have done, it either approves or condemns them ; and if it did no more, it would only prove a judgment in this life, and every man his own judge. But because it *also* in reference to our good actions creates in us a complacency, confidence, &c. and in reference to our evil actions accuses us, and breeds in us fearful expectation, &c. and all this apart from any thing to be enjoyed or suffered in this life, therefore it is not so much a judge as a witness, bound over to testify for or against us at some judgment after this life to pass on us. For all men "are a law unto themselves,"..."their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men ;" Rom. ii. 14, 15, 16. [*but q. as to the connection of ver.* 16. *with the preceding.*]

424. 2. *God*, who made us, and hath full dominion over us:...(*a*) In Himself :—"verily a God that judgeth in the earth ;" Psal. lviii. 11...and no less essentially *just* than *God*....."Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right ?" Gen. xviii. 25. We must therefore conclude that He is a most just judge—and as necessarily also that after this life He will judge the world in righteousness.

---

423. How does a future judgment appear demonstrable from consideration of our own conscience and its operation ? 424. (*a*) How from consideration of the perfect justice of God, especially when we regard the rewards and punishments of men in this life ? 424. (*b*) Shew that the doctrine of future judgments is certainly true, as being expressly revealed by God in His word.

For as the affairs of this present world are ordered, though they lie under the disposition of providence, they shew no sign of universal justice :.....rewards are not correspondent to the virtues, nor punishments to the sins, of men..... There must then be a judgment yet to come, in which God will shew a perfect demonstration of His justice, and to which every man shall in his own bosom carry an undeniable witness of his actions.*—(*b*) In His word : whence, beside the previous considerations of human conscience and Divine justice, we have a yet more enforcing persuasion,....."It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment ;" Heb. ix. 27... the one as certain as the other. For in all ages God hath revealed His resolution to judge the world. The intimation given to angry Cain, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted ? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door," Gen. iv. 7. by the most ancient Jewish interpretation refers to the judgment of the world to come. Enoch's prophecy, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of His saints to execute judgment, &c." Jude 14, 15. might have an aim at the Deluge, but the ultimate intention looked through that fire which shall consume the world preserved from water.—The testimonies in the Law and the Prophets, the predictions of Christ and the Apostles, are so many and so well known as not to be here repeated :—...nothing more certain in the word of God, no doctrine more clear than that of "eternal judgment ;" Heb. vi. 2.

---

* From a serious apprehension of the power of conscience and the justice of God, the heathens concluded that there was a judgment to come. Insomuch that when St Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, *Felix trembled ;*" Acts xxiv. 25.....and when the same Apostle declared to the Athenians that God "hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead," xvii. 31 though he found "some" who "mocked when they heard of the resurrection of the dead," yet against the day of judgment none replied.

(423, 424. *Illustrate by instances recorded in Scripture the expectation entertained by the heathen of a judgment to come.)

425. II. *Who* that Person is which "shall come to judge."

426. The Judiciary power is the power of God, and none other hath any right to judge His subjects and servants. The law by which we are to be judged was given by Him, the actions to be discussed were due to Him, the persons to be tried are subject to His dominion. "*God*" therefore is "the Judge of all;" Heb. xii. 23. *and see* Eccles. xii. 14; Rom. ii. 5. Now if God *as God* be Judge of all, whosoever is God is Judge of all men,.....wherefore the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*, shall judge the world...[*compare a similar conclusion as to the Omnipotence of the Three Persons, par.* 414.]

427. But yet in that particular day of the general judgment to come, the *execution* of the Judiciary power shall be particularly committed to the *Son*, and so the Father and the Holy Ghost shall *actually* judge the world no otherwise but *by Him*. For "God hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained;" Acts xvii. 31. "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son;" John v. 22. There is therefore a Judiciary power (*a*) *Original*, supreme, which Christ as *God* hath with the Father and the Holy Ghost; (*b*) *Derived*, given by commission, which Christ as *man* hath from the Father expressly, from the Holy Ghost concomitantly. For "the Father hath given Him authority to execute judgment, because He is the

---

426. To whom alone, and wherefore, does supreme Judiciary power by right belong? What follows, in respect of the future judgment, with regard to the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity? 427. To which of the Three Persons of the Trinity shall the *execution* of the Judiciary power be committed in the day of judgment? Distinguish between the *original* and *derived* judiciary power of Christ. "The Father hath given Christ authority

Son of man;" John v. 27. *not simply* because He is *a man*, (which would apply to every man...) but because of the *Three Persons* who are *God*, *He only* is *also* the Son of man; and therefore most fit for that office; in respect of

428. i. *Himself*, who is to judge: for we must look *not only* on His *being* the Son of Man, *but also* on what He *did* and *suffered* as the Son of Man. He humbled Himself so far as to take our nature upon Him, humbled Himself to all its infirmities, &c. to all the sorrows which the sins of all the world could cause; wherefore in regard of His humiliation did God exalt Him, part of which due exaltation was the power of judging. "The Father," therefore, who is only God, and never took upon Him the nature of men, "judgeth no man;" (and the same reason applies to the Holy Ghost;) "but hath committed all judgment to the Son:"..... "because He is" not only the Son of God, and so truly God, but also "the Son of man," and so truly man; "because He is" that "Son of man" who suffered so much for the sons of men:.....a great demonstration this of the justice of God, so highly to reward that son of man, as to make Him Judge of all the world, who came into the world, and was here judged and condemned.....

429. ii. *Ourselves*, who are to be judged: whom can we desire to appear before rather than Him who is of the same nature with us? If the children of Israel could not bear the presence of God as a Lawgiver, but desired to receive the law through Moses, how should we appear

---

to execute judgment *because He is the Son of man:*" What is here to be understood beyond the mere fact of Christ's humanity? 428. Illustrate Christ's fitness for the office of Judge from considerations of what He hath done and suffered as the Son of man, and the Divine justice manifested in His consequent exaltation. "The Father judgeth no man, &c." Shew that what is here asserted of the Father is applicable also to the Holy Ghost. 429. Illustrate

before the presence of that God judging us for a breach of that law, were it not for the presence of a better Mediator, also of our nature, who is our Judge? In this appears the wisdom and goodness of God, that making a general judgment He will make a visible Judge, whom *all* may see who shall be judged.....Christ who is both God and man is appointed Judge; so as He is *man*, *all* shall see Him; and as *God* they *only* (for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," Heb. xii. 14. consequently the wicked could not see their Judge were He *only God*) shall see Him who by that vision shall enjoy Him.

430. *Christ Jesus* then, the Son of God and Son of man, He which was "born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, &c. &c. *He*," the same person, in the same nature, "shall come to judge the quick and the dead." "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father, &c. and then He shall reward every man according to His works;" Matt. xvi. 27....."The same Jesus which was taken up...into heaven, shall so come, &c." Acts i. 11, by a true and local translation of the same [human] nature out of heaven. For God will "judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given an assurance unto all men in that He hath raised Him from the dead;" Acts xvii. 31. *and see* Rom. xiv. 9. It appears therefore by God's determination, by Christ's resurrection and ascension, (the ascension of the same Jesus who was raised from the dead,) that the man Christ Jesus is appointed Judge.

Christ's fitness for the office of Judge from considerations relating to ourselves as of the same [human] nature with Him, and to His being man as well as God. 430. Shew from Scripture that from the resurrection and ascension of Christ we are assured that He shall be Judge.

431. This office and dignity of the Son of man was often declared by several figurative and parabolical descriptions.....He is thus represented as making the great decretory separation, and the last judicatory distinction between man and man, as a *husbandman* separating the wheat, sometime from the chaff, Matt. iii. 12. sometime from the tares, xiii. 30, 39. as a *fisherman* gathering the good fish, casting the bad away, xiii. 47, 48.—as a *bridegroom* receiving the wise, excluding the foolish, Virgins, xxv. 10.—as a *master* distinguishing his servants, rewarding the faithful, punishing the unprofitable, xxv. 19, 21, 30.—as a *shepherd* dividing his sheep from the goats, placing one on the right hand, the other on the left, xxv. 31, &c.

432. III. What the *nature* of this Judgment may be, *how* this action shall be performed.

433. The *reality* of this act consists in the final determination and actual disposing of all persons, in soul and body, in their eternal condition: the *manner* of its performance is not so certain to us, but, which is sufficient for us, it is represented under a formal judiciary process. In which 1. There is described a throne of judicature, on which the Son of man shall appear as a Judge: "In the regeneration the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory," Matt. xix. 28.;—a seat not only of majesty but of judicature; compare "ye also (the Apostles) shall sit on twelve thrones, judging....." and "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them;" Rev. xx. 4, and "I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat upon it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away;" Rev. xx. 11. "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ;"

---

431. Mention some of the figurative and parabolical descriptions under which Christ is in Scripture represented as Judge. 433. In what does the *reality* of the act of the future judgment consist? Recount, quoting

Rom. xiv. 10. and 2 Cor. v. 10.—2. There is to be a personal appearance of all men before that seat of judicature See the two texts just quoted. Rev. xx. 12. "All nations shall be gathered before him;" Matt. xxv. 32. "He shall send His angels,.....and they shall gather together His elect, &c." xxiv. 31. For "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" is "our gathering together unto Him;" 2 Thess. ii. 1—3. The actions of all men, thus brought before Christ's judgment-seat, shall appear. "He will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, &c." 1 Cor. iv. 5....."will bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, &c." Eccl. xii. 14. To this end...when "the judgment was set, the books were opened;" Dan. vii. 10. and ..."the books were opened, and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books, according to their works;" Rev. xx. 12.—4. According to their actions a definitive sentence will be passed on all men's persons, which is the fundamental and essential consideration of this judgment: the sentence of absolution,..."Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;"...of condemnation,..."Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels;" Matt. xxv. 34, 41.—5. The execution of the sentence: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal;" xxv. 46.—.....

434. Particular 4. The object of this action;—*who* are "*The Quick and the Dead*"—a phrase several times delivered in Scripture, and that on the same

---

requisite texts, the steps of the formal judiciary process by which the *manner* of it is represented to us in Scripture.

434. "The quick and the dead." Give Scripture instances of the use of this phrase. Why is it capable of several interpretations?

occasion: Christ was "ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead;" Acts x. 42. "is ready to judge the quick and the dead;" 1 Pet. iv. 5. "shall judge the quick and the dead;" 2 Tim. iv. 1.....There is however some ambiguity in it;—the Holy Ghost speaking of death in several notions, "the quick and the dead" are capable of several interpretations.

435. (*a*) Because after death the *soul lives*, the *body* remains *dead*, some have understood the *souls* of men by "the quick," their *bodies* by "the dead;" —when the meaning would be that Christ should come to judgment immediately on the resurrection, when the souls which were preserved alive shall be joined to the bodies which were once dead, and so men shall be judged entirely both in body and soul, &c.—But though men shall be judged when their souls and bodies are united, &c.....yet the above interpretation cannot be admitted, i. because it is not certain that all men shall die, properly, so that their bodies shall be left any time without their souls; ii. because this [phrase now considered] is *not* a distinction of the *parts* of *man*, *but* of the *persons* of *men*.

436. (*b*) Because the Scripture often mentions a *death* in *sins* and a *living* unto *righteousness*, some have conceived "the *quick*" to mean the *just*, "the *dead*" the *unjust*;—so that Christ should judge the former by a sentence of absolution, the latter by a sentence of condemnation.—But though the dead be sometimes taken for sinners, the living for the righteous, and though Christ shall judge them both, yet this metaphorical sense is not here probable, because there is no adjunct so intimating, because the literal sense affords a fair explication, and further, because Scripture in the same particular naming the quick and the dead sufficiently teaches us to understand it of a corporal death. "Whether we live or die, we are the Lord's:.....Lord both of the dead and the living;" Rom. xiv. 8, 9.

---

435. Why have some understood by "the quick" the *souls*, by "the dead" the *bodies*, of men? What according to them would the phrase imply in reference to the general judgment? Why is their interpretation inadmissible?

436. Answer the same questions in reference to those who have understood by "the quick" the *just*, by "the dead" the *unjust*.

437. (*c*) Therefore by "the dead" are to be understood *all* who ever *died before* Christ's coming to judgment, by "the quick" such as shall *then* be *alive*.....And this undoubtedly is the proper and literal sense of the Article, that Christ shall come to judge not only those who shall be alive on the earth at His appearing, but also all such as have lived and died before.....who, that they may be judged, shall rise to life.....

438. The only doubt remaining in this interpretation is, whether those who shall be found *alive* when Christ cometh, shall so continue till they come to judgment, or—as some have thought, persuaded by a consideration of our mortality and its cause, (that it is appointed unto *all* men once to *die*, in that *death* hath passed upon *all*,)—shall on His first appearance immediately die, and then be restored to life again, that *all* may be *partakers* of the *resurrection*.—But the Apostle's description of the last day mentions no such kind of death, rather excludes it: "For we which are *alive* and *remain unto the coming* of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are *asleep*. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven, &c. and the *dead* in Christ shall *rise* first; then we which are *alive* and remain shall be caught up together with them, &c." 1 Thess. iv. 15., &c.....This doctrine (that they who are then living shall not die) is put out of question by the addition of what the same Apostle elsewhere says, "Behold, I shew you a mystery, we shall *not all sleep*, *but* we shall *all* be *changed*." ....."The *dead* shall be *raised* incorruptible, and *we* (which shall *not sleep*) shall be *changed*:" 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52., so that to the *living* which remain at

---

437. What remains as the true meaning here of "the quick and the dead," and the proper sense of the Article?
438. What only doubt, and induced by what consideration has been objected to this interpretation? Confute from Scripture the objection so raised.

the coming of Christ their *mutation* shall be *as a resurrection.* It should seem that no man had ever doubted this conclusion had they not first differed in the reading of the text. [One reading in ver. 51. was, "we shall *not* all be changed:" Pearson concludes, in a note, that there is no reason to question the received reading.]

Practical uses of Belief that Christ shall come to judge the Quick and the Dead.

439. This belief is necessary: i. In respect of the *judgment to come:* (*a*) To prevent the dangerous doubts arising against the ruling of the world by the providence of God. That which made David confess his "feet were almost gone, &c." Psal. lxxiii. 2, &c. hath hurried multitudes to perdition. The conspicuous prosperity of the wicked, and apparent misery of the righteous, &c. &c. have raised a strong temptation of mistrust whether there be a God that judgeth the earth—A temptation not to be repelled by any thing in this life considered alone. Except there be after death a life to come, and in that life rewards and punishments otherwise dispensed than here they are, in order to which dispensation there must be an universal judgment to come, how can we ground any acknowledgment of an over-ruling justice?.....—(*b*) To provoke ourselves i. to the breaking off our sins by repentance: such being the sweetness of our sins, so great our confidence of impunity here, that it were unreasonable to expect that any man should forsake his delights, and by repentance embitter his soul, except we looked for an account hereafter; but being persuaded of it, and also possessed of a sense of our sins,.....who will not "flee from the wrath to come?" Matt. iii. 7. What must the "hardness" be "of that impenitent heart which treasureth up unto itself wrath against the day of wrath, &c.?" Rom. ii. 5.—ii. to the regulating our future actions by the word of God; we being naturally so inclined to follow our own wills, &c. that we should find no reason to satisfy any other desires than our own, especially the pressing and exact dictates of the word of God, should not be likely to render obedience, unless

---

439. What are the practical uses of belief in Christ's coming to judge the quick and the dead? Quote illustrative texts.

we expected an account to be given of all our actions, and that to be exacted according to the rule of God's revealed will, who "shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel;" Rom. ii. 16.—iii. to keep a conscience void of offence;.....if there were no judge but our own souls, we should be regardless of our own sentence, [*see par.* 423.] but when persuaded that the reflections of conscience are to be so many witnesses before the tribunal of heaven for our absolution or condemnation, we must infallibly watch over that unquiet inmate, and endeavour above all things for a good conscience. "Seeing that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation. &c., looking for, &c., the coming of the day of God!" 2 Pet. iii. 11. Reason itself will tell us thus much; but further, "the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us, that denying ungodliness, &c. we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" Tit. ii. 11., &c.——2. In respect of *Christ as Judge:* for the strengthening our hope, augmenting our comfort, establishing our assurance of eternal life. If we look on the judgment to come only as revealing our secrets, sentencing us according to our works, not one of us can expect life from that tribunal, nor happiness at the last day: we have all sinned, and every sin of ours deserves sentence of death, as also the best of our actions bears no proportion to eternity, can challenge no degree of that weight of glory.....Therefore must we believe that Christ shall sit on the throne,—that we shall receive our sentence not according to the rigour of the Law, but the mildness and mercies of the Gospel, and then we may look not only on the precepts, but also on the promises, of God.....If we consider whose Gospel that is by which we shall be judged, and who shall judge us by it, "we are members of His body, &c. for which cause He is not ashamed to call us brethren;" Eph. v. 30; Heb. ii. 11. .....Well may "we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him," Eph. iii. 12. unto the throne of that Judge who is our Brother, Redeemer, High-Priest, Advocate, who will not by His word at the last day condemn us, because He hath already in the same word absolved us, saying, "..... He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life;" John v. 24.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. VII.

440. I am fully persuaded of this as a necessary truth, that the Eternal Son of God, in that human nature in which He died and rose again and ascended into heaven, shall come from the same heaven, and at His coming shall gather together all which shall then be alive, and all which before that day shall have lived and died; when causing them to stand before His judgment-seat He shall judge them all according to their works done in the flesh, and passing the sentence of condemnation on the reprobates shall deliver them to be tormented with the Devil and his angels, and pronouncing the sentence of absolution on the elect shall translate them into His glorious kingdom of which there shall be no end. Thus I believe in Jesus Christ, who SHALL JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD.

ART. VIII. I believe in the Holy Ghost.

441. ["I believe in".....*See explication of these words under Art.* I., *to which Pearson refers the reader.*—*See especially pars.* 1, 3, 4, 19, 23.—Therefore] For the explication of this Art. it will be sufficient here to set forth I. The *Nature* of the *Holy Ghost;* under which may be considered whatever concerns the *Spirit* of God as *such*, (*Ghost* or *Gast* in ancient Saxon signifies a *Spirit*,) and His *intrinsical sanctity:*—II. His *office;* in which may be described whatever belongs to the *emanation* of that *sanctity*, and *communication* of its *effects.*

442. I. In the indagation of the *Nature* of the Holy Ghost, it will be needless first to prove the *existence* of the Spirit of God. The resurrection, angel and spirit, which the Sadducees refused to ac-

---

440. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who professes his belief that *Christ shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* 441. What are the two particulars relating to the Holy Ghost necessary to be set forth for the explication of Article VIII? and what may be considered under each of them? 342. Shew, quoting requisite texts, &c. that it will be needless to begin the indagation of the Nature of the Holy Ghost by proving his *existence.*

knowledge, Acts xxiii. 8. were but *two* particulars, of which the Pharisees confessed *both*—angel and spirit (conjoined) being the one ; wherefore what the Sadducees disbelieved was the existence of such *created spiritual* natures as angels and human souls are conceived to have. It cannot therefore be proved from Acts xxiii. 8. (as some have concluded) that the Sadducees denied the existence of the Spirit of God, any more than the existence of God, who is a Spirit : nor did the notion which the Jews had of the Spirit of God incline them to reject it.—As for the disciples at Ephesus who had "not so much as heard whether there be an Holy Ghost." Acts xix. 2. if Gentiles, it is no wonder, for they had never that notion in their religion ; if Jews, as they seem, having been baptized with John's baptism, it signifies .....only that they had not heard of the *giving* of the Holy Ghost, which the Apostle mentioned. As we read elsewhere, "the Holy Ghost was not yet ;" John vii. 39., not denying the existence, but the plentiful effusion of it. For it is inconceivable that the Apostle should deny His existence (whatsoever His nature be supposed) before Christ's glorification, whose operation was so manifest at His conception. However, St Paul's question, "unto what then were ye baptized ?" intimates that if they were baptized according to the rule of Christ in the baptismal institution, Matt. xxviii. 19. they could not be ignorant that there *is* a Holy Ghost.—The only question remains, *what* that Holy Ghost is ? To determine which we assert,

443. 1. That the Holy Ghost is a *Person:* even as the Father and the Son, the *other two* of those *Three* in whose name we are baptized, are *Persons*,

---

443. Why would it be presumptuous and unreasonable, even before taking into account the positive evidence to the contrary, to suppose the Holy Ghost nothing but an operation or quality ?

which all confess. That blessed Spirit is not only an energy or operation, not a quality or power, but a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. If we conceive it as an operation only, then it must be actuated, and not act; and when not actuated it cannot *be* at all;—if we say it is a quality and not a substance, we say that it is that which we cannot prove to have any being.....If there were no argument but this, that we are assured by the Christian faith that there *is* a Holy Ghost existing, and *cannot* be *assured*, either by reason or faith, that there is a *quality* really and essentially *distinguished* from all *substance*, it would be sufficient to deter us from the boldness of asserting the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, to be nothing else but a quality.

444. But we are not left to guess at the nature of the Spirit of God: the word of God, which came from that Spirit, hath sufficiently delivered Him as a *Person*. It is indeed to be observed that in Scripture there are *some* things spoken of the Holy Ghost which are *proper* to a person, as the adversaries confess; *others not properly* to be attributed to a Person, as we cannot deny:—hence it might *seem* equally doubtful whether the Holy Ghost were a person or no.....*But* then we must *also* observe that the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is *not* always taken in the same propriety of signification; *nor* do we say that the Holy Ghost, which signifies a Person, *always* signifies so much. It is therefore easily conceived how *some* things may in Scripture be attributed to the Spirit which are *not proper* to a person, because sometimes the Spirit is taken for that which is

---

444. Some things are in Scripture spoken of the Holy Ghost which are proper, some which are not proper, to a person:—why do the latter contain nothing to invalidate the conclusion for the Personality of the Holy Ghost drawn from the former?

not a Person, whereas if *ever any* thing be attributed to the Holy Ghost as to *a* Person which *cannot* be *otherwise* understood of the Spirit of God than as of a *Person*, then we may infallibly conclude that the Holy Ghost is a Person. We shall therefore demonstrate

445. A. That the Scriptures declare to us the *Holy Ghost* as a *Person* by such attributes and expressions as cannot be understood in any other sense. i. The Holy Ghost, or *good* Spirit of God, is clearly opposed to those *evil* spirits which must be acknowledged Persons.... "The Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him;" 1 Sam. xvi. 14. What those evil spirits from the Lord were, (even bad angels,) is apparent from what we read concerning Ahab, "there came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him; &c." 2 Chron. xviii. 20, 21.....ii. Again, the New Testament describes the Holy Ghost by such dispositions and with such operations as are as evident marks of a Person as any attributed to the Father and the Son, unquestionable Persons, (and whatever terms are spoken of the Spirit by way of *quality* are spoken as well of those which are acknowledged Persons.) We are exhorted "not to grieve the Spirit of God;" Eph. iv. 30.—grief is a *personal* affection, of which a *quality* is *not* capable. The same "Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered;" Rom. viii. 26.—this can only be understood of a *Person*. The operations of the Spirit are manifest, and as manifestly *personal;* He "searcheth all things, even the deep things of God;" &c. 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. He "worketh" all the spiritual gifts, "dividing to every man severally as He will;" xii. 11. He revealeth the will of God, &c...

---

445. Shew that the Scriptures describe to us the Holy Ghost as a *Person*.

"The Spirit said unto Peter, Behold three men seek thee. Arise....I have sent them;" Acts x. 19. and "the Holy Ghost said" to the prophets, &c. at Antioch, "Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them;" xiii. 2. Christ Himself, who sent Him, thus describes Him; "The Comforter (or Advocate) which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things; He shall testify of Me; and ye also shall bear witness. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you. And when He is come, He will reprove the world; He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He shall shew you things to come. He shall glorify Me, for He shall receive of Mine, and shall shew it unto you." John xiv. 26; xv. 26, 27; xvi. 7, 8, 13, 14. All which words are nothing else but so many descriptions of a Person; a Person hearing, receiving, &c. &c.

446. The adversaries to this truth, acknowledging these personal expressions, answer that it is ordinary in Scripture to find the like given to things which are not persons; *e.g.* "Charity suffereth long, and is kind, &c. &c." 1 Cor. xiii. 4—7. All which personal actions are attributed to charity, which is no person, as in other cases it is usual, but belonging to that person which is charitable, because the person so qualified performs those actions according to, and by virtue of, the charity which is in him. In the same manner, say they, personal actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no person, but only the virtue, power, and efficacy of *God the Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ; because God the Father is a Person, and

---

446. How do the Socinians attempt to answer the argument drawn from the Scriptural expressions attributing Personality to the Holy Ghost?

performs those personal actions attributed to the Holy Ghost by that virtue, &c. in Himself, which is the Holy Ghost; and *thus* e.g. Acts x. 19; xiii. 2; it is to be understood that *God the Father* spake to Peter, sent the men, &c. and said to those at Antioch, Separate Me Barnabas and Saul, &c.....

447. But this answer is most apparently insufficient:.....If *all* the *personal* actions attributed in Scripture to the Spirit, might proceed from the Person of God the *Father*, it might seem satisfactory.....but if, as shall be proved, there are *several personal* attributes given in Scripture expressly to the *Holy Ghost* which *cannot* be ascribed to the *Father*, which God the *Father* by that power which is in Him *cannot* be said to do, then there cannot be any ground why those attributes should be given to the Spirit if it be not a person.—Now "the Spirit...maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God;" Rom. viii. 27. To make intercession is a personal act here attributed to the Holy Ghost; it is *not* an act which can be attributed to God the *Father*, *neither* can *He* be said to intercede for us according to the power that is in Him; and therefore this can be no prosopopœia..."When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father," John xv. 26. saith Christ; and again, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you;" xvi. 7.....when the Holy Ghost *cometh* to men, as *sent* by the *Father* in the name of the Son, and sent by the *Son* Himself, this *personal* action *cannot* be attributed to the *Father* (who, moreover, *never* is *sent*) as working by the power within Him, and consequently cannot ground a prosopopœia by which the power of God the Father shall be said to do it.—"When He," saith Christ, "the Spirit of truth is come, He

---

447. Shew the futility of this answer.

will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak;" xvi. 13. Now to speak and not of Himself, *cannot* be attributed to God the *Father*, who doeth all things of Himself; to speak what He heareth, and that of the Son, to deliver what He receiveth from another, and to glorify Him from whom He receiveth by so receiving, as Christ speaks of the Holy Ghost, xvi. 14. is *by no means applicable* to the *Father:* consequently it cannot be true that the Holy Ghost is said to do these *personal* actions because the Person whose Spirit the Holy Ghost is doth them by His own power, which is the Holy Ghost.

448. .....Socinus however hath prepared another explication.....The Spirit, that is, the power of God, saith he, may be considered either as a power in God, or as the things on which it works are affected with it. If considered in the first notion, then if any personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the *Spirit* is there taken for *God*:...if considered in the second, then if any personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the *Spirit* is taken for *that man in which it worketh.*

449. *Easily refuted.* The Holy Ghost is said to *come* to the *Apostles* as *sent* by the *Father* and the *Son*;.....a *personal* action which *cannot*, as already shewn, be the action of the *Father* who *sent* the Spirit, and as certainly *cannot* be the action of an *Apostle* who was *affected* with the Spirit so *sent*.....Again, our Saviour, speaking of the Holy Ghost, saith, "He shall *receive* of Mine;" John xvi. 14. therefore the Holy Ghost in that place is *not* taken for the *Father;* "and *shew* it unto *you*;" therefore He is *not* taken for an *Apostle*; in that He *receiveth*, the first Socinian prosopopœia is improper; in that He *sheweth* to the *Apostles*, the second is absurd.

---

448. What further explication did Socinus contrive?
449. Shew the futility of this second explication.

450. B. That those attributes or expressions used of the Holy Ghost in Scripture, and pretended to be repugnant to the nature of a Person, either are not so repugnant, or if they be, belong to the Spirit as it signifies not the Person, but the gifts or effects, of the Spirit. They tell us that the Spirit is given, sometimes in measure, sometimes without measure, and that men drink of it, &c. that it is doubled, distributed, &c. that sometimes it is extinguished;—expressions inconsistent with personality.—But this objection is easily refuted. God indeed is said to have "given the Holy Ghost to them that obey Him;" but a *Person* may be *given*; "unto us a Son is given;" Isai. ix. 6. "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son;" John iii. 16.—And if all the rest of the expressions be such as they pretend, they prejudice not the truth of our assertion, because we acknowledge the effects and operations of the Spirit to have in Scripture the name of the Spirit, who is the cause of them. And since to that Spirit as the cause those attributes are given, as already shewn, which can agree to nothing but a Person, we conclude, against the Socinians and the Jews, that the *Holy Ghost* is *not* a *quality but* a *Person*.

451. 2. That the Holy Ghost is *not* a *created*, but a *Divine* and *uncreated*, Person.

452. (*a*) In proof of which assertion we shall first use an argument furnished by our adversaries,... raised from the words, "For who knoweth the

---

450. Instance some Scriptural expressions used of the the Holy Ghost which the Socinians object against His Personality. Shew that one of them—what?—is not inapplicable to a Person, and that others, even if so inapplicable, are rightly to be understood in a sense—what?—which does not invalidate the orthodox doctrine.—Against what opponents is the Personality of the Holy Ghost asserted? 451, 452. In proving that the Holy Ghost is *not* a *created* Person, what admission of the adversaries themselves may first be alleged?

things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God;" 1 Cor. ii. 11. They endeavour to prove from this place that the Holy Ghost is *not* a *Person*, arguing that because He is the Spirit of God, and by nature in God, therefore the things proper to the Divine nature are attributed to Him, and then that because there is *another person* in the *Divine* essence, and as they say, there can be *but one*, therefore the Holy Ghost is not a person. Whereas therefore *independently* from this place we have proved that the Holy Spirit is a *Person*, and from this place have inferred with them that the same Spirit is *in God* (it is vainly replied by some that this is not expressed in the text, it being necessarily implied) and of the *Divine* nature, it follows that He is *not* a *created Person*. [*see note in Pearson.*]

453. (*b*) The Holy Ghost is such a one as against whom a sin can be committed, and when it is so, cannot be remitted. Therefore He is a *Person*, or we could not commit that sin against Him, and *uncreated*, or the sin committed against Him could not be irremissible. The argument is grounded on our Saviour's words, "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him, but, &c. &c." Matt. xii. 31, 32.....They answer, that the sin against the Holy Ghost is not therefore unpardonable because He is God; which is not to our purpose: but they cannot shew that it can be unpardonable if He were not God. It is not unpardonable simply because committed

453. Prove that the Holy Ghost is a *Person*, and *uncreated*, from the words of our Saviour concerning the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Shew the futility of the Socinian objection to this application of the passage.

against God, which would apply to *any* sin committed against any person which is God; but that sin which is particularly called blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is a sin against God, and so aggravated as makes it irremissible, which could not be if the Spirit were not God.

454. (*c*) Every *created* person was made by the Son of God as God, and is now put under His feet as man. But the Spirit of God was not made by the Son of God, nor is now put under the feet of the Son of man:—therefore can be no *created* Person. "All things were made by the Word, and without Him was not any thing made that was made;" John i. 3. God "hath put all things under the feet" of Christ, God only manifestly "excepted, which did put all things under Him;" 1 Cor. xv. 27.....But the Spirit of God in the beginning was not made, yea rather made the world, as Job speaks of God, "By His Spirit He hath garnished the heavens;" xxvi. 13. nor is He under the feet of Christ...who with supreme authority together with the Father sent the prophets,—"Now the Lord God and His Spirit hath sent me;" Isai. xlviii. 16.—and with the same authority since the exaltation of our Saviour sent forth such as were separated to Himself, *e. g.* Barnabas and Saul, and giveth all spiritual gifts, dividing to every man severally as He will, so that in this kingdom of Christ all things are done "by the power of the Spirit of God;" Rom. xv. 19.

455. (*d*) Christ because conceived in the womb of the Virgin by the operation of the Holy Ghost is therefore called the Son of God;—"the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, &c. therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall

---

454. Prove, quoting requisite texts, that the Holy Ghost is *no created* Person, because in the beginning not made by Christ, nor now subjected under His feet. 455. Prove the same truth from Christ's being called the Son of God

be called the Son of God ;" Luke i. 35.—whereas if a creature had been the cause of Christ's conception, He had in that respect been the son of a creature.—Therefore the *Spirit of God* is *no created Person* :—(Our second assertion ; against the ancient, but newly revived, heresy of the Arians and Macedonians.)

456. 3. That the Holy Ghost is *properly* and *truly God :* which assertion necessarily follows from the preceding two, that He is a *Person*, and *not* a *created* Person.....—And it is proved even by the adversaries of those preceding two assertions : The Socinian, who denies the first, affirms that the Spirit of God is in God, and is the eternal and omnipotent power of God ;—the Macedonian, who denies the second, asserts that He is a Person :—Now whatsoever is a Person subsisting of eternal and omnipotent power must be God.—But independently of all that has been already demonstrated, there is enough written in the word of God to assure us that the Holy Ghost is God.

457. (*a*) When Moses "went in before the Lord to speak with Him, he took the veil off until he came out ;" Exod. xxxiv. 34. Now that Lord was the one Jehovah. But *the Spirit* was and is that same *Lord ;*—according to the Apostle's interpretation, "even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit ;" 2 Cor. iii. 15, &c. The Spirit is here so plainly said to be the Lord, *i. e.* Jehovah, the One eternal God, that the adversaries must

---

because conceived in a Virgin by the operation of the Holy Ghost.—Against what heretics is it asserted that the Holy Ghost is *not* a *created* Person ? 456. Shew that the assertion of the proper Godhead of the Holy Ghost necessarily follows from the preceding assertions 1, 2. and that it is proved even by the admissions of the respective adversaries of those assertions. 457. When Moses "went in before the Lord, &c. he took the veil off, &c." Exod. xxxiv. 34. From St Paul's interpretation of the passage,

either deny that the Lord is here to be taken for God, or, that the Spirit is to be taken for the Spirit of God..... But both these they do deny.....*The Lord*, they say, is *Christ*, and not God; for Christ, they say, is not God;—*the Spirit*, they say, is the mystery or *hidden sense of the Law*.....But the following words, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," assure us that the Apostle by *the Spirit* did mean the Spirit of God, not the sense of the Law, which sense is never called the Spirit of the Lord.....Moreover, the name of *Spirit* in the places mentioned by them, Rom. ii. 29; vii. 6; Rev. xi. 8. as signifying the sense of the Law, has no affinity with this, according to their own way or arguing, being never so taken with the emphasis of an article, and put in the place of an entire subject or predicate, except by way of opposition. [*see note in Pearson.*]—Again, by *the Lord* the Apostle *did* understand the eternal God: for he speaks of the same Lord as he mentioned in the verse before, and that is the Lord God spoken of in Exodus; otherwise his argument has no inference nor coherence. Vainly therefore do they answer that by *the Lord* the Apostle always understands Christ, unless he cites from the old covenant; for here he *does* cite from *it*:—and moreover, there is no certainty in the rule by which they would restrict the application of *the Lord* to Christ only.

458. (*b*) When Peter said, "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" Acts v. 3. he repeats the same question in reference to the same offence, "why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God;" 4. To *lie unto the Holy Ghost* is to *lie unto God*;...is not to lie unto men, because the Holy Ghost is not man, consequently not...to any creature, because the Holy Ghost is no creature; but to lie unto God, because the Holy Ghost is God.—The very multitude of the answers brought against this plain argument shews the weakness

---

2 Cor. iii. 15, &c. prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost.—and shew the futility of the Socinian evasions of the force of the Apostle's declaration that "the Lord is that Spirit."

452. Prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost from *lying to the Holy Ghost*, in the case of Ananias, being represented by St. Peter as equivalent to *lying to God*:—and refute objections to the orthodox argument.

of them all.....i. It is objected that the Holy Ghost in the original is put in one case, God in another, and that the Apostle speaks in one manner of the Spirit, in another of God. But the case or manner can make no difference, if the sense and substance be the same ; as here it is ; for to deceive the Holy Ghost is nothing else but to lie to Him.....The act objected to Ananias was but one, which St. Peter shewed to be not committed against men (the Apostles) but God (the Holy Ghost).....ii. As for the sense of *counterfeiting the Holy Ghost*, (as if Ananias had pretended that he acted by the motion of the Holy Spirit,) which some would put on the words, different from that of *lying* to God, the words here can have no such sense, for Ananias' sin is again expressed in the case of his wife Sapphira, with whom he is charged with agreeing to "tempt the Spirit of the Lord." 6. which was manifestly here nothing else but lying to Him.....iii. And whereas further they tell us, that though the phrases were synonymous, they did no way prove the Holy Spirit to be God, because in several places of Scripture the messengers of God, who are acknowledged not to be God, are mentioned in the same relation to God as here the Spirit is,—our answer is plain, that there is no creature ever mentioned in the same manner as the Holy Ghost is here. As when they allege 'He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us His Holy Spirit." 1 Thess. iv. 8.....if the Spirit be not understood in (after) the first words "He that despiseth," the place has no relation to the present question ; if it be,.....it were.....another confirmation [of our argument]. As for the other, "He that heareth you heareth Me ; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me : and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me." Luke x. 16. ; *and see* Matt. x. 40., it has nothing in it like what founds our reason ; *i. e.* no opposition..... if the Spirit of God were not God, as we are sure it is not man, it might as well have been said, you lied not unto the Holy Ghost, but unto God..... and properly to aggravate the sin of Ananias the Apostles must have said, Thou hast not lied unto men, nor unto the Spirit of God, but unto God.

459. (*c*) That Person whose *inhabitation makes a Temple*, is *God ;* for the notion of a temple is

---

459. Prove the same truth from the bodies of Christians being by St. Paul called *Temples* because of the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost : and refute objections.

nothing else but to be the house of God, not of any creature. But the inhabitation of *the Holy Ghost* makes a temple; "what, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?" 1 Cor. vi. 19. Therefore the Holy Ghost is God.——To this is replied differently according to the diversity of our adversaries.....i. They first tell us we must prove that the Holy Ghost is a Person, and that He possesses our bodies by a Divine right. But we have already proved Him a Person, nor can He possess us by any other than a Divine right. To evince the contrary they urge only those words of the Apostle, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. iii. 16., which but the more confirm our assertion...We know no other reason why we are the temple of God when the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, but only because we know that the Spirit of God is God. If the Spirit were a Person not Divine, or were not a Person, though Divine, we could not be assured that He did properly inhabit in us, or that if He did, He could thereby make a temple of us.—ii. Another objects only that since the Holy Ghost who possesses us is a Person, we must shew that our bodies are His by interest, and dedicated to His honour, which the objector conceives they are not. But it were very strange if we should be baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost should have no interest in us, but that He should be ours by interest, and not we His, that the Spirit of God should call for men to be separated to Himself, and that they so separated should be no way dedicated to His honour. If the Holy Ghost hath no interest in us because *given* to us, neither for the like reason hath Christ .....iii. And whereas it is said that "the Apostle hath hinted in what respect our body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, to wit, by inhabitation,"...by this very and only notion we are fully confirmed in our belief. For I know no other way by which God peculiarly inhabits in us, but in the inhabitation of the Spirit; nor how can we be the temple of God but by the inhabitation of God: "Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, &c." 2 Cor. vi. 16.....

460. (*d*).....Those *attributes* which are properly

---

460. Prove the same truth from attributes in Scripture given to the Holy Ghost.

Divine, with which consequently none can be endued to whom the nature of God belongs not, such as Omniscience, Omnipotency, Omnipresence, and the like, belong as certainly to the *Holy Ghost* as to God the Father. Therefore we are as much assured that the Holy Ghost is God. The Scriptures to prove these attributes are so well known that I need not mention them, so many that to manage them against the adversaries' exceptions would take up too much room.....

461. (*e*)...Those *works* which are properly *Divine*, such as consequently can be produced by no other than God, works by and for which God hath required us to acknowledge and worship Him as God, are often in Scripture attributed to the *Spirit of God;* as the Creation and conservation of all things, the miracles wrought on and by our Saviour, the works of grace and power wrought in the hearts of believers, and the like. Therefore...I conclude my third assertion, that the Holy Ghost is...properly and truly God.

462. 4.....That the Holy Ghost is *neither* God the *Father*, *nor* the *Son* of God.

463. (*a*) Though the Father be God, though the Holy Ghost be also God, and (because there cannot be two Gods) the same God, yet *the Holy Ghost* is *not* the *Father*.....For, i. It is impossible any person should proceed from Himself; but the Holy Ghost "proceedeth from the Father;" John xv. 26.—ii. No person can be sent by himself and by another from himself; but the Holy Ghost is sent by the Father, and by the Son "from the Father."

464. (*b*) Though the Son of God is God, and the Spirit of God is God, and in reference to both we understand the same God, yet *the Holy Ghost* is

---

461. And from works attributed to Him. 462, 463. Shew that the Holy Ghost is not the same Person as the Father. 462, 464. Nor the same Person as the Son. 462, 465. Quote texts in which the Holy Ghost is

not the *Son*.....For i. No person can receive from himself that which is his own, and glorify himself by so receiving; but of the Holy Ghost Christ expressly said, "He shall glorify Me, for He shall receive of Mine;" John xvi. 14.—ii. He whose coming depended on the Son's departing, and His sending after His departure, cannot be the Son who departed that He might send Him. But the coming of the Holy Ghost did *so* depend.....as Christ told His Apostles..."If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart, I will send Him unto you;" John xvi. 7.

465. (*c*) Though.....*the Holy Ghost* be the same God with God the Father and God the Son, yet the Scriptures frequently represent Him as *distinguished both from* the *Father* and the *Son*. i. As, when "the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and lo, a voice from heaven, &c." Matt. iii. 16. He was manifestly distinguished from the person of the Son, on whom He lighted, and from the person of the Father, who spake from heaven.—ii. "Through the Son we have an access by one Spirit, unto the Father;" Eph. ii. 18.; the Spirit, *by whom*, is *not* the *Father*, *to whom*, *nor* the *Son*, *through whom*, we have that access.—iii. "God sent forth His Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons:" and "because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, &c." Gal. iv. 4., &c. Where—the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father and the Son, as sent by the Father after He had sent the Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us several times;...iv. "The Comforter whom the Father will send in My name; the Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father:" John xiv. 26; xv. 26.....v. "Go teach

---

distinguished both from the Father and the Son. Against what ancient heresy is the distinctness of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son asserted?

all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" Matt. xxviii. 19.....Therefore I conclude, (against the old Sabellian heresy,) that the Holy Ghost, though truly God, is neither God the Father, nor God the Son.

466. 5. That the Holy Ghost is the *Third* Person in the Blessed Trinity.....As there is a *number* of Persons in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor less than Three, so is there also an *order* by which of these Persons the Father is the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third:—an order not arbitrary, but necessary...i. *α.* The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son to the Father; eternally indeed, therefore admitting no priority of time; yet must there be acknowledged a priority of order, by which the Father, not the Son, is first, and the Son, not the Father, second.—*β.* Again, the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son to the Holy Ghost: eternally, therefore admitting no priority of time, yet that of order must be observed: so that the Spirit, receiving the Godhead from the Father, the first Person, cannot be the first;.....from the Son, the Second, cannot be the second; therefore must be the third.—ii. *α.* Both the number and order are signified together by the Apostle; "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one;" 1 John v. 7. [*The reader is probably aware of the critical controversy as to the genuineness of this text.*] *β.* And the same number is sufficiently declared, and the order expressly mentioned, in the baptismal institution; Matt. xxviii. 19.

---

466. Shew that the Holy Ghost is in order the *Third* Person of the Blessed Trinity.

467. 6. That the Holy Ghost is a Person *proceeding from the Father and the Son*...He is the most high and eternal God, of the same nature, attributes, and operations, with the Father and the Son, as receiving the same essence from the Father and the Son by proceeding from them both.

468. (*a*) In Scripture this procession of the Spirit from the *Father* is *expressly* delivered; "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father,..." John xv. 26. This is also evident from what has been already asserted: for since the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God are yet distinct in their personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other, wherefore because the Father hath it from none, the Spirit hath it from Him.

469. (*b*) The procession of the Spirit from the *Son*, though not expressly delivered in Scripture, is *virtually* contained there, because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in reference to the Father because He proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in reference to the Son; wherefore the same reason must be presupposed in reference to the Son.—i. The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of God, and of the Father, because he proceedeth from the Father;....."The Spirit of your Father;" Matt. x. 20. For by the Apostle's language "the Spirit of God" is "the Spirit which is of God;" 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12. But the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son; ".....God

---

468. Shew that the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father is a truth expressly delivered in Scripture, as also evidently following from their identity in nature but difference in person. 469. Shew that the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son is *virtually* contained in Scripture.

hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son... ....." Gal. iv. 6.—"the Spirit of Christ;" Rom. viii. 9. 1 Pet. i. 11.—"the Spirit of Jesus Christ;" Phil. i. 19. Wherefore He must be so called because He proceedeth also from the Son.—ii. The Holy Ghost is sent by the Father because He proceedeth from the Father, as from Him who hath by the original communication a right of mission; "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send;" John xiv. 26. But the same Spirit is also sent by the Son; "when the Comforter is come, whom I will send;" xv. 26. Therefore the Son having the same right of mission must have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by, but sendeth, the Son, because He received not the Godhead from, but communicated it to, the Son: in the same manner neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by, but both the Father and the Son sendeth, the Holy Spirit, because neither of them received the Divine nature from the Holy Spirit, but both communicated the Divine nature, common to them both, to the Holy Spirit.

470. In the primitive times the *Latin* Fathers taught expressly the procession of the Spirit from the Father *and the Son*, because by good consequence they collected so much from the Scriptures above used to prove that truth. And the *Greek* Fathers, though they stuck more closely to the *language* of Scripture, saying that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, and not saying that He proceedeth from the Son, yet acknowledged under another Scripture expression the same thing:.....usually when they said He *proceedeth from the Father*

---

470. What was asserted as to the procession of the Holy Ghost by the *Latin* Fathers in the primitive times? How did the *Greek* Fathers differ from them in *language* as to this particular? Shew that this involved no difference of doctrine.

they added He *received of the Son:* which words according to the Latins inferred a procession, and what the Greeks understood thereby was the same which the Latins meant by the procession from the Son, *i.e.* the receiving of His essence from Him.....

471. This being the general doctrine of the Eastern and Western Churches, differing only in the manner of expression,...Theodoret gave the first occasion of a difference,.....denying that the Holy Ghost receiveth His essence from the Son, because the Scripture saith He proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit which is of God. But S. Cyril, against whom he wrote, little noticing this objection, and Theodoret's writings being condemned, there was no sensible difference in the Church for many years concerning this particular. Afterwards divers of the Greeks expressly denied the procession from the Son, and several disputations arose in the Western Church, till at last the Latins put it into the Constantinopolitan creed, and being admonished by the Greeks of that as of an unlawful addition, and refusing to rase it out of the creed again, it became an occasion of the vast schism between the Eastern and Western Churches.—But though this addition to the formal creed without the consent, and against the protest, of the Oriental Church be not justifiable, yet what was added is a certain truth, and may be so used in that Creed by them who believe the same to be a truth, so long as they pretend it not to be a definition of that Council, and condemn not those who out of a greater respect to such synodical determinations, will admit of no such insertions. [The *general* council of Nice had only, "I believe in the Holy Ghost:" The *general* council of Constantinople, against Macedonius,

---

471. How in regard to the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son did the great schism arise between the Eastern and Western Churches? [443, 451, 456, 462, 466, 467. What are the six assertions in which the *Nature* of the Holy Ghost has been declared?]

who made the Holy Ghost a *created* Person, added, "the Lord, and Giver of life,* who proceedeth from the Father:" The clause "and from the Son" was afterwards added by the *Latins.* – See the Notes in Pearson on this part of the Article.]

472. II. Having declared the *Nature* of the Holy Ghost, as the Spirit of God, we are now to declare His *Office*, as the *Holy* Spirit. For though He may be called Holy in Himself, being of infinite and essential holiness as God, and may also be termed Holy in contradistinction from created spirits either actually now become unholy, or at first of defectible sanctity, yet is He rather called the Holy Spirit, or Spirit of Holiness, because to make us holy is His particular Office:—by which Office is to be understood—*not* any *ministerial* office, such as that of the created angels, "all ministering spirits, &c. &c." Heb. i. 14., He because a Person properly Divine being above all ministration, but—whatsoever is attributed to Him peculiarly in the salvation of man, as the work wrought by Him, for which He is sent by the Father and the Son. For all the Divine Persons concur to our salvation. "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, and through that Son we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father;" John iii. 16; Eph. ii. 18.....And because without holiness it is impossible to please God, because we are all unholy, and the holiness required in us must be wrought in us by the (therefore called Holy) Spirit of God, therefore we acknowledge His office to consist in the sanctifying of the servants of God. The parts of which office are

---

472. How may the Holy Ghost be called Holy in Himself, or by way of distinction from other spirits? But why is He rather so called? What is His peculiar office?

* τὸ Κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποιὸν, *i.e.* "the Lord, and the Giver-of-life." *G.*

473. 1. *Revelation* and *illumination.* Since by nature we are void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God, since "none knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God," this "Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God," 1 Cor. ii. 10. 11. and revealeth them to men, so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is dispelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of their God. This work of the Spirit is double: (*a*) *External* and *general*, as to the whole Church of God; namely, the *revelation* of the will of God, by which so much in all ages has been propounded as was sufficient to instruct men unto eternal life. There have been "holy prophets ever since the world began;" Luke i. 70. "prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" 2 Pet. i. 21. When God "in these last days spake unto us by His Son," Heb. i. 2. even that Son sent His Spirit into the Apostles, the "Spirit of truth," that He might "guide them into all truth, teaching them all things, &c." John xvi. 13; xiv. 26. Thus "all Scripture was given by inspiration of God;" 2 Tim. iii. 16.—(*b*) *Internal* and *particular;* namely, the *illumination* of the understanding of believers, that they may receive the truth..... Christ is not only given unto us, in whom we believe, but it is also "given us in the behalf of Christ to believe on Him;" Phil. i. 29. and this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us an assent to that which by the word is propounded: by this "the Lord opened the heart

---

473. What are the two branches of the work wrought by the Holy Spirit in enlightening men with the knowledge of God? What heretics have denied the necessity of the internal operation of the grace of God to enable a man to believe the gospel?

of Lydia, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul;" Acts xvi. 14. by this "the word preached profiteth, being mixed with faith in them that hear it;" Heb. iv. 2. Thus "by grace are we saved through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God;" Eph. ii. 8. As the increase and perfection, so the initiation of faith is from the Spirit of God, not only by *revelation* of the *will* of *God*, but also (which we affirm against the old and new Pelagians) by *illumination* of the *soul* of *man*.

474. 2. *Regeneration* and *renovation*. Our natural corruption consisting in an aversation of our wills and depravations of our affections, an inclination of them to God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God. ".....He saveth us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" Tit. iii. 5. So that "except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" John iii. 5. We, all at first defiled by the corruption of our nature and the pollution of our sins,..."are washed,...sanctified,...justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God;" 1 Cor. vi. 11.

475. 3. The *leading*, *directing*, and *governing* us in our actions, &c. that we may do what is acceptable with God "If we *live* in the Spirit," quickened by His renovation, "we must also *walk* in the Spirit," Gal. v. 25. following His direction, &c. and if we *so* "walk, we shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh," v. 16. for we are not only directed but animated and actuated in those operations by the Spirit of God, "who giveth both to will and to do," and "as many as are" thus "led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God;" Rom. viii. 14. And that this direction may prove

---

474. In respect to regeneration and renovation what is wrought by the Spirit of God? Quote texts. 475. What in respect to the directing, animating, &c. of our

more effectual, we are also guided and actuated in our devotions by the same Spirit: "I will pour upon the house of David,.....the Spirit of grace and of supplications;" Zech. xii. 10. Whereas then "this is the confidence that we have in Him, that if we ask any thing according to His will, He heareth us," 1 John v. 14. and whereas "we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, &c..... maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God;" Rom. viii. 26, 27. From which *intercession* especially I conceive He hath the name of *Paraclete* given Him by Christ. For "if any man sin, we have a *Paraclete* with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," saith St John, 1 John ii. 1. "who also maketh intercession for us," saith St Paul, Rom. viii. 34. and we have "*another Paraclete*" saith our Saviour; which also "maketh intercession for us," saith St Paul Rom. viii. 26, 27. (Παράκλητος is in Scripture used only by St John; four times, in his gospel, of the Holy Ghost; once, in his first epistle, of Christ. See note in Pearson.)

476. 4. The *joining us to Christ*, and making us members of that one body of which He is the Head. "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." And "as the body is one and hath many members, &c. so also is Christ;" 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. "Hereby we know that God abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us;" 1 John iii. 24.....That union with the body and unto the head.....a spiritual conjunction..... proceedeth from the Spirit; and "he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit;" 1 Cor. vi. 17.

---

actions? Quote texts. What appears to be the correct Scripture notion of Παράκλητος? 476. What is wrought by the Holy Ghost in respect of joining us to Christ? Quote texts.

477. 5. The *assuring* us of the *adoption* of sons, the creating in us a sense of God's paternal love, and giving us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost;" Rom. v. 5. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God;" viii. 14. And "because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father;" Gal. iv. 6....."We have received the Spirit of adoption, &c. The Spirit itself bearing witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God;" Rom. viii. 15, 16.....And because being sons we are also "heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ," viii. 17. we by the same Spirit, by whom we were born again, and assured of our adoption, have the pledge, or rather the *earnest*, [see Pearson's observations and note,] of our inheritance. For "He which establisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God, who hath also sealed us, and hath given the earnest of His Spirit in our hearts;" 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. see also Eph. i. 13, 14.

478. 6. For the effecting of all these and the like particulars, the *sanctifying* and *setting apart persons* for the duty of the *ministry*, ordaining them to intercede between God and His people, to send up prayers to God for them, to bless them in the name of God, to teach the doctrine of the gospel, to administer the sacraments instituted by Christ, to perform all things necessary "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;" Eph. iv. 12. The same Spirit which empowered the Apostles personally to perform

---

477. What in respect of assuring us of adoption, &c. Quote texts. 478. What in respect of ordination of ministers? Quote texts. [473--478. What are the parts of which the *Office* of the Holy Ghost consists?]

their Apostolical functions, fitted them also for the ordination of others, and the committing of a standing power to a successive ministry unto the end of the world; who are thereby obliged to "take heed unto themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers, &c." Acts xx. 28.

Practical uses of belief in the Holy Ghost.

479. This belief is necessary: (*a*) As being an essential part of the Creed; for since the Creed is a profession of that faith into which we are baptized, since the first rule of faith was derived from the sacred form of baptism, since we are baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," we must profess faith in them three; that as they are distinguished in the institution, so they may be in our profession...— (*b*) Because of the excellent graces and abundant gifts of the Holy Ghost. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with us all," 2 Cor. xiii. 14. ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian. For "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His;" Rom. viii. 9....." No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost;".....1 Cor. xii. 3. ." That which is born of the Spirit is spirit;"....." that which is born of the flesh is flesh;" John iii. 6. What then is to be desired in comparison of the "supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ," Phil. i. 19. especially considering Christ's encouragement,....." If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" (*c*) That "the will of God" may be effectual in us, "even our sanctification;" 1 Thess. iv. 3. If "God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit," 2 Thess. ii. 13., if we be "elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience," 1 Pet. i. 2.....how should we "follow peace with all men, and holiness, &c." Heb. xii. 14, how endeavour "to cleanse ourselves, &c. perfecting holiness in the fear of God!" 2 Cor. vii. 1. "The temple of God

---

479. What are the practical uses of belief *in the Holy Ghost?* Quote requisite texts.

is holy, which temple we are, if the Spirit of God dwelleth in us;" 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. (and see vi. 19, 20.) wherefore we ought to "glorify God, &c." Thus is this belief necessary, that "our hearts may be established unblameable in holiness before God, &c. at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c." 1 Thess. iii. 13.—(*d*) That we may be in all weaknesses strengthened, in all infirmities supported, in all discouragements comforted, in the midst of miseries filled with peace and inward joy. "The kingdom of God is.....righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" Rom. xiv. 17. We read of early disciples that they "were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost;" Acts xiii. 52. of others, "followers of them and of the Lord, who received the word in much affliction, but with joy of the Holy Ghost;" 1 Thess. i. 6.....With this "oil of gladness though the Son of God was anointed above His fellows," Psal. xlv. 7.; Heb. i. 9. yet with the same are they anointed also: "we have an unction from the Holy one," 1 John ii. 20. (and see 27.)—(*e*) For the continuation of a successive ministry, and a Christian submission to the acts of their function, unto the end of the world. As the Father sent the Son, and "the Spirit of the Lord was upon Him, because He had anointed Him to preach the gospel," Luke iv. 18. so the Son sent the Apostles, "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you:..... He breathed on them, and saith.....Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" John xx. 21, 22, and as the Son sent the Apostles, so they sent others by the same Spirit, as St Paul sent Timothy and Titus, and gave them power to send others, saying to Timothy, "Lay hands suddenly on no man," 1 Tim. v. 22. and to Titus,....."I left thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, &c." Tit. i. 5. Thus by virtue of an Apostolical ordination there is for ever to be continued a Ministerial succession. Those which are thus separated by ordination.....are to "feed the flock of God, &c." 1 Pet. v. 2. and those which are committed to their care are to "remember and obey them that have the rule over them, &c. for that they watch for their souls as they that must give an account;" Heb. xiii. 7. 17.

Summary of Truths Confessed by him who affirms his belief in the Holy Ghost.

480. I resolvedly assent to this as a certain truth, that beside all other whatsoever to whom the name of Spirit is or may be given, there is one particular and peculiar Spirit, truly and properly a Person, not a created but uncreated Person, and so the true and one eternal God, yet not the Father nor the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the third Person in the blessed Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son: — I believe this Spirit to be not only of perfect and indefectible holiness in Himself, but also the immediate cause of all holiness in us, revealing the will of God, inspiring the Apostles, and enabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetual succession to continue the edification, of the Church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons to Christ, assuring them of the adoption of sons, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions, by all ways and means purifying and sanctifying their souls and bodies to a full and eternal acceptation in the sight of God. Thus I believe in THE HOLY GHOST.

ART. IX. The Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints.

481. This Article is in some Creeds placed last; and of its two parts, the latter is added, the former augmented; the most ancient professing no more than to believe "the Holy Church;" the word "Catholic" was added by the Greeks, and at last received into the Latin Creed.

---

480. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief in *the Holy Ghost.* 481. What is to be observed of the IXth Article with regard to the variety of its position in different creeds, and the additions made to it as originally stated?

§. 1. THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

482. In expounding this part of the ART. will be shewn

483. I. What is the meaning of the *Church*, which Christ hath propounded to us.

484. 1. For the understanding of the true notion of the Church, it must be observed that the *nominal* definition or derivation of the word is *not sufficient* to describe the nature of it,—whether as regards the English word *Church* (or Kirk), derived from the Greek Κυριακὸς, first signifying the house of the Lord, *i.e.* of Christ, and thence taken for the people therein meeting,—or the Greek word Ἐκκλησία, used by the Apostles, signifying, according to origination, a *calling forth*, according to usage, a congregation of men, or a company assembled.....

485. 2. (*a*) The Church has been taken for the whole complex of men and angels worshipping the same God: but since Christ took not on Him the nature of angels, &c., since they are not mentioned in Scripture as members of the Church, &c., the proper notion of the Church will not here be looked on as comprehending more than *men*. (*b*) The Church has been taken as comprehending *all men believing in God since the foundation of the world:* but though whosoever from the beginning pleased God were saved by the blood of Christ, the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world, yet *a.* because there was a vast difference between the dispensations of the Law and the Gospel,

---

482, 483, 495, 500, 505. What must be shewn in expounding the clause "The Holy Catholic Church?" 484. Shew that the nature of the Church here intended is not sufficiently described by the *nominal* definition or derivation of the word. 485. To whom, and in opposition to what notions of greater latitude, must the notion of the Church be here restrained?

β. because Christ spoke of building Himself a Church when the Synagogue was about to fail, γ. because Catholicism, here attributed to the Church, must be understood in opposition to the legal singularity of the Jewish nation, and δ. because the Fathers generally distinguished between the Synagogue and the Church, therefore the notion of the Church must here be restrained to *Christianity.*

486. 3. We must therefore search into the New Testament, and from the places there which mention the Church conclude its nature.....A Church our Saviour before His death promised *should be built;*" "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church ;" Matt. xvi. 18. After His ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, when Peter had converted 3000 souls, Acts ii. 41. which were added to the 120 disciples, i. 15. we find a Church *built* (upon Peter, according to Christ's promise,) and of a nature *capable* of daily *increase;* "The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved ;" ii. 47. We must then search into the true notion of the Church of Christ by looking into the origin and increase of it.

487. What we are infallibly assured of its first actual existence is only this : There were twelve Apostles with the Disciples before the descent of the Holy Ghost ; and "the number of the names together were 120;" Acts i. 15. After the Holy Ghost descended on the Apostles, and St Peter preached to the Jews that they should "repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were

---

486. Whence must we conclude the true nature of the Church? Quote the passage wherein it is first mentioned as promised to be built, and passages shewing the fulfilment of the promise. 487. Of whom did the Church at first consist? Quote requisite texts.

added unto them about 3000 souls ;" ii. 38, &c. These thus added "continued stedfastly in the Apostles, doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." This was then the Church ;—a certain number of men, some, Apostles, some, the former disciples, others, persons who repented, believed, were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the sacraments administered, joining in the public prayers presented to God ;—daily increased by the addition of other persons received into it on the same conditions, making up "the multitude of them that believed," Acts iv. 32. who "were of one heart and one soul," "believers added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women ;" v. 14.

488. But.....because that Church was *one* by way of *origination*, and was afterwards divided into many, the members of that one becoming the members of several Churches, and that Church which we believe is otherwise *one* by way of *complexion*, receiving into it the members of all Churches, we must consider [further] how at first those several Churches were constituted, that we may understand how in one Church they are all united : and must for this purpose examine the several acceptations of this word in the New Testament.

489. The original word, Ἐκκλησία, is i. Sometimes used, as by the native Greeks, to express an *assembly*, without relation to worship. Acts xix. 32, 39, 40. ii. Sometimes, as in the Septuagint, for the *assembly* (the *congregation*) of *God's people* under the *Law*. Acts vii. 38 ; Heb. ii. 12.—iii.

---

488. How was that Church *one* ? In what other way is the Church which we believe *one* ? Why is it requisite to shew how those several Churches into which the one primitive Church was divided, were constituted ? 489. In what senses is Ἐκκλησία used in the New Testament ?

Sometimes, it has been conceived, used, even in Scripture, for the *place* in which the members of the Church met for public religious services; some passages, Acts xi. 26; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22, seem to speak no less, yet may as well be spoken of the people congregated in such a place. iv. Beside these few different acceptations, the *Church* always signifies *a company of persons professing the Christian faith*:—but not always in the same latitude.—[In this its usual sense]

490. A. Sometimes it admits of *distinction* and *plurality*. (*a*) In general are often mentioned "the *Churches*," Acts xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xiv. 34; 2 Cor. viii. xi. xii; Rev. xxii. 16. "the *Churches* of God," 1 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 16. "the *Churches* of the Gentiles," Rom. xvi. 4. "the *Churches* of the saints," 1 Cor. xiv. 33. - (*b*) In particular, we find a few believers gathered together in the house of one person called a *Church*, as the *Church* in the house of Priscilla and Aquila, Rom. xvi 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19.....of Nymphas, Col. iv. 15.....of Philemon, 2.....—(*c*) Again, when the Scripture speaks of any country where the Gospel had been preached, it always names by way of plurality the *Churches* of it, as "the *Churches* of Judæa," Gal. i. 22, "of Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria," Acts ix. 31, "of Galatia," 1 Cor. xvi. 1. "of Asia," 19. and see Rev. i. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Cor. viii. 1: Gal. i. 2.

491. B. Sometimes it reduces all into *conjunction* and *unity*. (*a*) For though there were several such *Churches* or congregations [as those last mentioned] of believers in great cities, yet the Scriptures always speak of such congregations in the

---

489, 490. In respect of the latitude in which it is used in its most usual sense, give instances of its admitting of distinction and plurality. 489, 491 .. of its reducing all into conjunction and unity; as regards the church of a district.

notion of *one Church*. To the Corinthians St Paul wrote, "Let your women keep silence in the *Churches*," 1 Cor. xiv. 34. yet dedicates his epistle "unto the *Church* of God which is at Corinth;" i. 2. So we read *not* of the *Churches*, *but* the *Church* at Jerusalem, Acts viii. 1.....at Antioch, xiii. 1.....at Cæsarea, xviii. 22.....at Ephesus, xx. 17.....of the Thessalonians, 2 Thess. i. 1..... of Laodicea, &c. see Rev. ii. iii. *passim*. Whence it appears that a *collection* of *several congregations*, *every one* in some sense a *Church*, is properly *one Church*, by virtue of the *subordination of them all under one ruler*;.....the several Churches within a populous city, and also those adjacent, were united under one Bishop, and therefore accounted one Church; the number of the Churches following that of the "angels," i. e. rulers of them: see Rev. i. ii. iii.

492. B. (*b*) Now as several Churches in relation to the single governor of them, so all the Churches in the world in relation to one supreme Governor of them all, even Christ, the Bishop of our souls, may be denominated one Church; under which appellation therefore the Apostle speaking of that in which all Churches agree comprehends them all, and therefore often by the name of Church are understood all Christians whatsoever belonging to any of the particular Churches dispersed throughout the world...such particular Churches being members of the general and universal Church, which is one by unity of aggregation. This is the Church in this creed, and in other creeds it is expressly termed *one*;..."one holy catholic Church."

———

492. In what most comprehensive extent may churches be reduced to the denomination of one church? What is the Church in this Creed? How is the unity expressly marked in some other creeds?

493. Therefore, further, to understand the nature of the Church, thus *one*, we must consider in what its unity consists. Since it is an aggregation not only of many persons but many congregations, its unity must consist in some agreement of them all, and adhesion to something which is one. If then we reflect on the first Church again, which we found constituted in the Acts, and to which all others since have been in a manner addded and conjoined, we may collect from their union and agreement how all other Churches are united and agree. [*See description of that first Church par.* 487.] The members of it were all built upon the same rock, all professed the same faith, received the same sacraments, performed the same devotions, and thereby were all reputed members of the same Church. To this church were added daily such as should be saved, who became members of the same Church by being built on the same foundation, by adhering to the same doctrine, receiving the same sacraments, performing the same devotions.

494. Whence it appears that besides the unity of the head, which is one Christ, and the life communicated from that head, which is one Spirit, the Church considered in itself is *one* by *unity*. a. Of *Origination*. This unity relies on the original of it, which is one ; as a house built on one foundation, though consisting of many rooms,...stones, is...but one house. Now "other foundation" of the Church "can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ ;" 1 Cor. iii. 11. And though the Apostles and Prophets be also termed the foundation, yet the unity is preserved, because they...stones in the foundation, are united by one corner stone; whereby

---

493. In what must the unity of this Church consist? How did members added to the first church become members of the same church? 494. Shew, quoting requisite texts, how the Church is one by unity of *origination*—of

such as are of the Church, being "fellow-citizens with the saints, &c. are built upon the foundation of the apostles, &c. Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone, &c." Eph. ii. 19, &c. which stone was "laid in Zion for a foundation, &c." Isai. xxviii. 16. there was the first Church built; and whosoever have been or shall be converted to the Christian faith, are and shall be added to that Church, and laid on the same foundation, which is the unity of origination. Christ gave the same power to all the Apostles, which was to found the Church; but He gave that power (particularly) to Peter, to shew the unity of the same Church.*—β. Of *Faith.* There is "One Lord, and one faith." Ephes. iv. 5. and that faith "once delivered to the saints;" Jude 3. which whosoever shall receive, embrace, and profess, must necessarily be accounted *one* in reference to that profession. For if a company of believers become a Church by believing the same truth.....They which believe the same doctrine, delivered by Christ to all the Apostles, by all the Apostles to believers, being all professors of the same faith, must be members of the same Church.—γ. Of the *Sacraments*..... "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" Matt. xxviii. 19. Now there is..... but "one baptism;" Eph. iv. 5. consequently the receivers of it are one. Again,..."Eat ye all of this, drink ye all of this;" (the Lord's Supper,) and all by communicating of one...become one. "For we being many are one bread and one

faith -of the *sacraments*—of *hope*—of *charity*—of *regimen and discipline.*

* See note by Pearson wherein, quoting a passage to this purpose from S. Cyprian, which the Romanists produce to prove the necessity of one Head of the Church on earth, and that the Bishop of Rome is that one Head by virtue of his succession to S. Peter, he observes that S. Cyprian speaks nothing of any such head or succession, only of the origination of the Church, which was so disposed by Christ that the unity might be expressed.

body ; for we are all partakers of that one bread;" 1 Cor. x. 17. As therefore the Israelites "were all baptized unto Moses, &c. &c." 1 Cor. x. 2., &c. and thereby appeared to be the one people of God, so all believers and all Churches congregated in the name of Christ, washed in the same laver of regeneration, eating of the same bread, and drinking of the ssme cup, are united in the same cognizance, and so known to be the same Church.—δ. Of *Hope.* Whosoever belongs to any Church is some way called, and all who are so, are "called in one hope of their calling;" Eph. iv. 4....we all "through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith ;" Gal. v. 5. They therefore which depend on the same God, and worship Him all for the same end, "the hope of eternal life, &c." Tit. i. 2..... may well be reputed the same Church.—ε. Of *Charity.* They which, however many, are all of one mind, are in reference to that mind but one, as all the members, animated by one soul, become one body...We *cannot* call those *many* who "endeavour to keep the *unity* of the Spirit in the bond of peace ;" Eph. iv. 3. "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another ;" John xiii. 35.—ζ. Of *Regimen and Discipline*.....In all the Churches of God the same Christ ruleth. For they have all the same pastoral guides, appointed, authorized, sanctified, and set apart, by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternal salvation : as therefore there is no Church where there is no order, no ministry, so where the same order and ministry is, there is the same Church.

495. II. How we are assured of the *existence* of the Church.

496. "I believe a Church" is not only an acknow-

496. With reference to the distinction between things past, present, and future, how is the Church in the Creed

ledgment of a Church which has been, or a Church which shall be, but also of that which *is*.....The act of faith is applicated to the object according to the nature of it; to what is already past, (*e.g.* the death of Christ,) as past; to what is to come, (*e.g.* the resurrection of the body,), as still to come; to that which is present as it is still present..... .....That which was when the Creed began, and was to continue till that Creed shall end, is proposed to our belief in every age as *being;* and thus ever since the first Church was constituted, the Church itself as *being*, was the object of the Church *believing*.

497. The existence therefore of the Church of Christ, (as that Church before is understood by us,) is the continuation of it in actual being from the first collection of it in the Apostles' times unto the consummation of all things. We must therefore prove that it was to receive a constant and perpetual accession, and be uninterruptedly continued in an actual existence of successive believing persons and congregations unto the end of the world.

498. Now this is a proper object of *faith*, because grounded only on the promise of God.....The Church is not of such a nature as *necessarily* thus to continue. Many persons have apostatized from the Church; many particular Churches have been wholly lost; nor has any particular Church power to continue itself more or longer than others:— consequently, since all *particulars* are *defectible*, the *universal* Church must *of itself be defectible*.

---

now propounded, and how has it in every age since it was constituted been propounded, as the object of faith? 497. What duration of existence do we ascribe to the Church, and what must we therefore prove concerning it? 498. Why is the uninterrupted continuance of its existence to the end of the world strictly an object of *faith?* How does it appear that the Universal Church is *not of itself indefectible?*

499. But though the providence of God permits many *particular* Churches to *cease*, His promise will *never* permit them *all at once to perish*. i. When Christ spake first particularly to St Peter, He said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. xvi. 18. which promise assures us of the continuance of the Church, because built upon a rock ;....." Whosoever, &c. I will liken him to a wise man which built his house upon a rock : &c. and it fell not, &c." Matt. vii. 24, 25. The Church of Christ is His house; for He hath "builded the house," and is "as a Son over His own house, whose house are we ;" Heb. iii. 3, 6. and as a "wise man" He hath built His house upon a rock, and what is so built shall not fall.—ii. When Christ spake generally to the rest of the Apostles, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them, &c." He promised, "and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world ;" Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, thus giving assurance not only of the continuance of the Church, but of the *cause* of that continuance, *i.e.* His presence ; "Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ, there is He in the midst of them ;" Matt. xviii. 20. and thereby they become a Church ; for they are as a builded house, and the Son within that house.....

500. III. How the Church is *Holy*, as the Apostle hath assured us.

501. 1. The Church is *universally* holy in respect of all persons called to the profession of the faith of Christ, and baptized in His name : (*a*) Because of the vocation whereby all its members are called, and separated from the rest of the world to "God"

---

499. Shew, quoting requisite texts, that nevertheless according to the promise of God it never shall perish.
501. In what respect and for what reasons is the Church *universally* holy ?

who "hath called us with an holy calling;" 2 Tim. i. 9.—(*b*) Because of the offices appointed and powers exercised therein, which by their institution and operation are holy.—(*c*)) Because of that engagement to holiness of life to which are bound whosoever are called to profess faith in Christ: "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ" (*i. e.* such as call on His name, which was the description of the Church, see Acts ix. 14, 21; 1 Cor. i. 2.) "depart from iniquity;" 2 Tim. ii. 19. —(*d*) Because the end of constituting a Church of God was the purchasing a holy people, and the great design thereof was for the begetting and increasing holiness, that God, originally Holy, might communicate His sanctity to men, whom He intended to bring to the fruition of Himself, unattainable "without holiness," without which "no man shall see the Lord;" Heb. xii. 14.

502. 2. But further, the Apostle hath delivered *another kind* of holiness, which *cannot* belong to the Church taken *in so great a latitude.* "Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it.....that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, &c. but that it should be holy and without blemish;" Eph. v. 25., &c. Now though it may be conceived that Christ did love and give Himself for the whole Church as containing all that ever called on His name, yet we cannot imagine the whole body of men could ever be so holy as to be without spot, &c. We must then find within the great complex body of the Universal Church that Church to which this *absolute* holiness belongs.

503. The Church, as it embraces all the professors of the true faith of Christ, contains in it not only

---

502. How has St Paul represented another (what?) kind of holiness, which must be more restricted (why?) in its application? 503. What two opposite kinds of persons

such as truly believe and are obedient to the word, but those also which are hypocrites and profane .....good and bad being both externally called, and both professing the same faith. For "the kingdom of heaven is like unto a field" in which "wheat and tares grow together unto the harvest;" Matt. xiii. 24, 30.—"like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind;" xiii. 47.—like "a floor" in which is laid up "wheat and chaff;" iii. 12.—like "a marriage-feast," in which some have on the "wedding garment," and some not; xxii. 11.....This is that "great house" in which "are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honour, and some to dishonour;" 2 Tim. ii. 20. There are "many called," of all which the Church consists, but "few chosen" Matt. xxii. 14. of those called. It is concluded therefore as by the ancient Catholics against the Donatists* that within the Church, in the public profession and *external* communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter saved; and together with them others void of all saving grace and hereafter to be damned: and that Church containing both may well be called *holy*, as St Matthew called Jerusalem "the holy city," iv. 5; xxvii. 53. even when there was therein a general corruption in manners and worship.

504. Of these promiscuously contained in the Church

A. Such as are void of all saving grace while they live.....*personally unholy* during life...are *by death separated* from the *external* communion of the

---

are comprehended in the *external* communion of the Church? Illustrate from Scripture this comprehensiveness: vindicated against what schismatics by the ancient Catholics? 504. When do the wicked totally cease to be

* Named from Donatus, Bishop of Casæ nigræ, or from another of the name? perhaps from both? who headed an opposition made to the election of Cæcilianus to the bishopric of Carthage, in the fourth century. They considered their own community alone the true Church, &c. See Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.

Church, and *having no* true and *internal* communion with the members and the head thereof, are *totally* and *finally cut off* from the Church of Christ.– B. Such as are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified, (*a*) while they *live* are *truly* holy ; (*b*) when they *die* are *perfectly* holy, and remain still united to the Church by that internal union by which before conjoined to the members and the head ;.....(*c*) And *at the end of the world*, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently cut off from the communion of the Church, when its remaining members being perfectly sanctified shall be eternally glorified, then shall the whole Church be *most completely* "holy.....glorious...and without blemish." Not that there are two Churches of Christ ;..... but one and the same Church in relation to different times admits or admits not the permixtion of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly.....

505. IV. How the Holy Church is *Catholic.*

506. The word *Catholic*, not occurring in Scripture, nor anciently in the Creed, but inserted by the Church, must be interpreted by the sense (to be confirmed so far as consentient with Scripture) which the most ancient Fathers had of it. They used it as to several intents :

507. 1. [When attributed otherwise than to the Church ;] (*a*) They called the epistles of SS. James, Peter, John, Jude, *Catholic*. because whereas St Paul's epistles were directed to particular Churches congregated in particular cities, these were sent either to the Churches dispersed through great part of the world, or directed to the whole Church of God. –(*b*) They use the word *Catholic* merely for *general* or *universal*, as, the Catholic resurrection,–

---

members of the Church ? Define how in respect to its godly members the Church is (or shall be) *truly* (though imperfectly) holy ;–*perfectly* holy ;—and *most completely* holy 506. How must we ascertain the interpretation of the word *Catholic ?* 507. When attributed otherwise than to the Church, in what senses is it used by the ancient fathers ?

Catholic opinion,—*i. e.* that of all men.—(*c*) The officer who collected the emperor's revenue in several provinces united into one diocese, was called *Catholicus* in distinction from the officers of the particular provinces under him: whence (*d*) the title was by some transferred to the Christian Patriarchs.

508. 2. As attributed to the Church; (*a*) Taken *locally* the *Catholic* Church only signified a *Parochial* Church, in contradistinction to a Church in a *Monastery*, a parish differing from a Monastery as having no distinction of habitations for men and women, and as having a *common* Church for both.—(*b*) Taken *personally*, *Catholic* is often added *in opposition to heretics and schismatics*, expressing a particular Church continuing in the true faith with the rest of the Church of God; *e. g.* the Catholic Church in Smyrna,—in Alexandria. These (though) *particular* Churches..... were called *Catholic* by their coherence and conjunction with that Church properly and originally called so, *i. e.* the Church taken in the acceptation already delivered.—(*c*) That universal Church, which was built on the Apostles, &c. &c..... containing within it numerous congregations, all truly called Churches, as members of the same Church, was after some time called the CATHOLIC Church, to distinguish the Church in this large and comprehensive sense from a Church in the sense of a particular congregation.....

509. At first then they called the whole Church [2. (*c*)] *Catholic*, meaning no more than the *universal* Church; but having some time used that term, they considered how the nature of the Church was to be universal, and in what that universality consisted. In all the following acceptations did some of the ancient fathers understand the Church of Christ to be Catholic, and every one certainly

---

508. As attributed to the Church, in what senses, especially in what most comprehensive sense? 509. In what acceptations did the ancient fathers consider, and do

belongs to it:—i. In regard of the *diffusiveness* of the Church, (the most obvious and general notion.).....By the commission given to its builders, "Go teach all nations," they and their successors were authorized and empowered to gather congregations of believers, and to extend the Church throughout the earth. The synagogue of the Jews especially consisted of one nation, and the public worship of God was confined to one country. "In Judah was God known, &c." Psal. lxxvi. 1, 2. "He shewed His word unto Jacob, &c. He hath not dealt so with any nation, &c." cxlvii. 19. The Temple was the only place in which sacrifices could be offered, &c. But God said unto His Son, "I will give Thee the heathen for thine inheritance, &c." ii. 8. And Christ commanded the Apostles, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem;" Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47....."Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, &c." Rev. v. 9. —ii. Because it *teaches all things necessary* for a Christian to know;..... As the Holy Ghost led the Apostles "into all truth," so they left all truth to the Church.....—iii. In reference to the *universal obedience* it prescribes; both as to all persons, and as to all precepts.....—iv. Because of *all graces* given in it, whereby all diseases of the soul are healed, and spiritual virtues disseminated.....till we become perfect men in Christ Jesus.—Wherefore it is concluded that the *Catholicism* of the Church consists generally in *Universality according to all these* (i—iv.) *acceptions.*

---

we in the Creed understand the Church in respect of its Universality to be Catholic? Quote requisite texts.

Practical uses of Belief of the Holy Catholic Church.

510. (*a*) We must believe *the Holy Catholic Church*, because Christ hath appointed it as the only way to eternal life. At first, "the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved," Acts ii. 47. and the same thing hath been done since continually....."There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved but the name of Jesus;" Acts iv. 12. which name is no otherwise given under heaven than in the Church. As none were saved from the deluge but those within the ark of Noah . . . , none saved of the first-born of Egypt but those within habitations whose door-posts were sprinkled with blood according to Divine appointment, none saved of the inhabitants of Jericho but those within the house of Rahab, according to covenant, so none shall escape the eternal wrath of God but those who belong to the Church of God. This is the congregation of those persons on earth who shall hereafter meet in heaven. (*b*) We must believe the Church of Christ, which is *one*, that we may take care, i. Never to be ejected from it. The Church has a power of ejectment: if "any neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man, &c." Matt. xviii. 17. By great and scandalous offences..... we may incur the censure of the Church, and while shut out by them we stand excluded from heaven. "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they, are retained;" John xx. 23. ii. Never to cast ourselves out of it; which may be done not only by *apostasy*, but by falling into some damnable *heresy*, or by an active separation deserting all in communion with the Catholic Church, and falling into irrecoverable *schisms*. (*c*) We must believe the Church *Holy*, lest we should presume to obtain any happiness by being of it, without the holiness required in it.....To receive real and permanent advantage by it they in its communion must be really and effectually sanctified. Otherwise its privileges prove the greatest disadvantages, and the means of salvation neglected tend to aggravate punishment. It is not only vain but pernicious to attend at the marriage-feast without a wedding garment, &c. (*d*) We must believe the *Catholic* Church, because except a man be

---

510. What are the practical uses of belief of *the Holy Catholic Church?* Quote requisite texts.

of that he can be of none. The Church which is truly Catholic contains within it all which are truly Churches. .....That Church alone which first began at Jerusalem on earth will bring us to the heavenly Jerusalem, and that alone began there which always embraces "the faith once delivered to the saints." Whatsoever Church pretends to a new beginning pretends to a new Churchdom, and what is so new is none.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. IX. §. 1.

511. I believe and profess as a necessary truth, that Christ by the preaching of His Apostles gathered to Himself a Church consisting of thousands of believers, and numerous congregations, to which He daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and daily add unto the same to the end of the world; so that by His all-sufficient promise I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto, now is, and shall be so long as the sun and moon endure, a Church of Christ one and the same. This Church I believe *in general holy* in respect of its author, end, institution, and administration: *particularly* in the members *here* I acknowledge it *really*, in the same *hereafter*, *perfectly holy*. I look on this Church not like that of the Jews limited to one people. .....but by Christ's command and assisting power to be disseminated through all nations.....propagated to all ages, to contain in it all truth necessary to be known, to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of Christ, and to furnish us with all graces necessary to make us acceptable in the sight of God. Thus I believe THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 2. THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

512. The comparatively late admission of this (equally true) part of this article into the Creed, is so far advantageous that thereby we may be the better assured of the true intent of it, as placed. For it must be explicated in the sense understood by the Church when it was first inserted.

---

511. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms that he believes *the Holy Catholic Church.*
512. In explicating "The Communion of Saints," how are we directed by a consideration of the time of the insertion of this clause in the Creed?

513. Looking on the community, &c. of goods among the first believers, Acts ii. 44, 45. and St Paul's urging "an equality, that the abundance of some might supply the want of others, &c." 2 Cor. viii. 14, 15, we might conceive the *communion* (or *communication?*) of the saints to signify the great charity, &c. among the people of God.—But α. since that community, precisely taken, was not of eternal obligation, nor actually of long continuance, β. since this Article does not wholly regard what is past, γ. especially since neither this custom nor notion was generally received in the Church when this "communion of saints" was first inserted,—*that* communion will be shewn which is attributed to the saints by the fathers who have delivered it, and according to the Scriptures whence they derived it: For the explication of which must be considered

514. I. *Who* and *what* kind of persons they are who are called Saints.

515. It is first taken for granted i. that though the word which we translate *Saints* (Ἅγιοι) be in itself applicable to *things* as well as *persons*, yet *here* it signifies *only persons* holy: ii. that it is *not* taken (as in the Septuagint it often is) for the *Sanctuary*, as if the Communion were nothing but a right of communicating, &c. the holy things of God; iii. that the singular *Holy One*, the Holy one of Israel..... is *not* (though the Communion of the Saints with Him is) comprehended in this Art. iv. that the holy *angels* (though sometimes in Scripture called Saints) are *not* the saints here said to have the Communion, (though the Saints have Communion with them.)

---

513. Why may not "the Communion of Saints" be here understood (as otherwise it might be) of the community of goods, charity, &c. among the first Christians? 514, 523, 524. What must be considered in order to the explication of it? 515. In ascertaining the meaning of "Saints," what senses are previously taken for granted to be *not here* applicable?

516. For this part of the Article has a manifest relation to the former:....."The Church" is "Holy," because the persons within it are, or ought to be, such; but because though the Church be holy, yet every person in it is not truly so, therefore is added this "Communion of Saints," which concerns those who are truly such. The Saints here mentioned are therefore members of the Church of Christ,.....who not only *profess*, but are *sanctified by*, the Gospel.

517. The only question then is, in *what* their saintship consists, and (because, though the believers since our Saviour's death be more highly sanctified, yet before and under the Law the servants of God were truly named Saints of God) *who* were the persons who are capable of that denomination?

518. Since God Himself hath given a rule to His people, both by way of precept and pattern, "Be ye holy," as "I the Lord your God am holy;" Lev. xix. 2; xxi. 8; and since we cannot have the *same* sanctity with God, it must be declared *what* this holiness is which makes men to be accounted holy ones and called *saints*.—The true notion of Saints is expressed by Moses when he calls them "*men of holiness*;" Exod. xxii. 31. such are the persons understood in this Article.

519. Holiness in its first acceptation signifies *separation*, both with regard to i. that from which the separation is made, and ii. that to which what is separated is applied. *e. g.* The holy

---

516. How is the clause now under consideration connected with, and more restricted than, the preceeding clause of the Article? 517. In inquiring in what *saintship* consists, what must be observed with reference to persons before as well as after the beginning of the Church of Christ? 518. How has Moses expressed the true notion of Saints? 518. What is the primary and general sense of holiness? How is it thus predicated of

things under the Law were separated from common use, and applied to the service of God..... Thus all persons called from the common condition of the world to any peculiar service or relation to God are thereby denominated holy, and in some sense receive the name of saints. The people of Israel are therefore in the Old Testament called an holy nation.....*all* as to their separation from all other nations and appropriation to God called *holy*, though most of that nation were rebellious to Him, and void of actual sanctity. So the New Testament authors, writing to such as were called, and had received and were baptized in the faith, give them *all* the name of *saints* as being *in some manner such* by being called and baptized. For *α.* since baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification, *β.* since every one so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world, which are not so, *γ.* since though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect,—therefore all such as have been received into the Church may be *in some sense* called *holy.*

520. But because *more* than an outward vocation and charitable presumption is necessary to make a man *holy*, we must find some other qualification which must make him *really* and *truly such*..... This must be learned out of the Gospel of Christ, —by which alone, ever since the Church of Christ was founded, any man can become a saint ;—whence we shall find that those are *truly*

---

the whole people of Israel? of all the professors of Christianity? 520. What further is required to make persons *really* and *truly holy?* Quote requisite texts. And who *accordingly* are *saints?* What saints are here *particularly* understood, in reference to distinction be-

and *properly* saints, which are "sanctified in Christ Jesus :" 1 Cor. i. 2. i. In respect of their holy *faith*, by which they are regenerated ; "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God ;" 1 John v. 1. purified ; God Himself "purifying their hearts by faith ;" Acts xv. 9. "washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus," "in whom also after that they believe, they are sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise ;" 1 Cor. vi. 11 ; Eph. i. 13.—ii. In respect of their *conversation ;* (i. e. behaviour, manner of life ;) "As He which hath called them is holy, so are they holy in all manner of conversation :" "adding to their faith virtue, &c. &c." 1 Pet. i. 15 ; 2 Pet. i. 5—8. Such persons then as are called by a holy calling and not disobedient to it are endued with, and purified by, a holy faith, as are sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God, and thereby lead a holy life, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God," 2 Cor. vii. 1. are really and truly saints, and being of the Church of Christ, (as all such *now* must be,) are the proper subject of the clause, "The Communion of Saints," as added to the preceding, "The Holy Catholic Church."

521. As with reference to these saints of the Church of Christ "the Churches of the Saints," 1 Cor. xiv. 33. are so called, was never any Church of God but there were saints in it. Moses speaks of "all the saints" of God ; Deut. xxxviii. 3. We read in the Psalms of the "congregation" and "assembly" "of the saints ;" lxxxix. 5, 7 ; cxlix. 1.—in the Prophets of "the saints of the Most High ;" Dan. vii. 25.—And at our Saviour's death "the bodies of" such "saints which slept arose ;" **Matt. xxvii. 52.**

---

tween the time *before* and *after* the beginning of the Church of Christ ? 521. Shew, quoting requisite texts, that there never was any Church of God but there were saints in it.

522. Who were saints while their bodies were in the grave; as Aaron in the time of David kept the name of "Saint of the Lord;" Psal. cvi. 16. Such as are holy in their lives lose not, but improve their sanctity at their deaths...—Hence the distinction between (*a*) The saints on *earth*, belonging to the *militant* Church; "the saints that are in the earth," Psal. xvi. 3. the saints of whom we read in the Acts, and to whom St Paul directed his epistles: and (*b*) The saints in *heaven*, belonging to the *triumphant* Church; as to whom the Apostle asks, "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" 1 Cor. vi. 2. And all those who were spoken of as saints then in the earth, if truly such and departed so, are, and ever shall be, saints in heaven.

523. II. *With whom* beside themselves, and how among themselves as Saints, the "Saints" have "communion." [The subdivisions under this head relate, 1—4. To those who differ from the Saints in *nature*:—5, 6, 7. *Not* in *nature*, but 5. in *sanctity*; 6. To Saints differing in *person* only; and 7. in *present condition* also.—*See Pearson.*]

524. III. *In what* the nature of *that communion* in each respect *consists.* [The particulars relating to this head are blended with those of the preceding.]

525. 1. The Saints of God living in the Church of Christ have communion with *God the Father*..... "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with *us*, and truly *our* fellowship is with the *Father*;" 1 John i. 3. Wherefore all the saints of God under the Gospel, receiving the doctrine of the Apostles, have communion with *them*.....consequently with the *Father*. As we are the branches of the Vine, so we are under the care and inspection of the Husbandman, the Father. As

---

522. Shew that saintship does not cease at death: and distinguish between the Church *militant* and the Church *triumphant*. Quote requisite texts. 525. Shew, quoting texts, the existence of, and particulars relating to, the

"Abraham believed God, &c. and he was called the friend of God," James ii. 23. so the heirs of Abraham's faith are made partakers of the same relation.....Yea, "behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the *sons* of God;" 1 John iii. 1.—Thus.....the Saints have communion with the Father, because by the "great and precious promises" given them, they "become partakers of the Divine nature;" 2 Pet. i. 4.

526. 2. With the *Son of God:* "our fellowship is with the Father *and the Son:*" 1 John i. 3. infallible connection; for "he that abideth in the doctrines of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son;" 2 John 9. and our Saviour prayed for all that should "believe on Him through the Apostles' word, that they might be one, as the Father is one in Him, and He in the Father, that they also may be one in both: &c." John xvii. 20, 21, 23 This communion with the Son of God is most remarkable: He hath taken on Him our nature, &c. our sins, &c. we all "have received of His fulness, &c." John i. 16. and are called to the fellowship of His sufferings, &c." Phil. iii. 10. Whatever is the fellowship of brethren and co-heirs of the Bridegroom and the Spouse, of members with the head, of branches with the Vine, that is the communion of Saints with Christ. "God hath called us unto the fellowship of His Son, &c." 1 Cor. i. 9.

527. 2. With the *Holy Ghost:*....."if there be any fellowship of the Spirit;" Phil. ii. 1 (a rhetorical assurance of the affirmative;)....."the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all;" 2 Cor. xiii. 14. The *Saints* are *such*, because they partake of the Holy Ghost,...who alone *sanctifieth.* Beside, the communion with the Father and the

---

communion of the Saints with God the Father. 526. With God the Son. 527. With God the Holy Ghost;

Son is wrought by the communication of the Spirit; for we become sons of God in that "we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father;" Rom. viii. 15. and we become co-heirs with Christ in that "because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, &c. so that we are.....sons, ...heirs of God through Christ;" Gal. iv. 6, 7, —This is the Communion which the Saints enjoy with the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, ...which was represented to Abraham, when "the Lord appeared unto him," and "three men stood by him;" Gen. xviii. 1, 2: — our Saviour promised, "If any man love Me, he will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him;" John xiv. 23.....Where these two inhabit, the Spirit must be present, for "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His:" Rom. viii. 9....."Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. iii. 16.

528. 4. With the holy *Angels.* They who foretold the birth of John the forerunner of Christ, who annunciated the Saviour's conception, sang a hymn at His nativity, carried the soul of Lazarus into Abraham's bosom, appeared from heaven to strengthen Christ in His agony, brought forth the Apostles from prison, shall at the end of the world sever the wicked from the just, &c. certainly have a perpetual relation to the children of God. Nay, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. i. 14.—"There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth;" Luke xv. 10....."these

---

(and, which is necessary implied, with the whole Trinity.)

528. With the Holy Angels.

little ones,.....in heaven *their* angels do always behold the face of My Father, &c." Matt. xviii. 10.

529. 5. They have *some* kind of *communion* with men *not truly saints*.....The saints while they are of the Church of Christ on earth have communion with hypocrites therein in all things with which the distinction of a saint and hypocrite can consist. They communicate in the same water, both externally baptized alike, in the same Creed, &c. in the same word, communicate at the same table,...but the hypocrite doth not communicate with the saint in the same saving grace, true faith, renovation of mind, &c.—and a saint doth not communicate with the hypocrite in the same sins, &c. unfruitfulness under means of grace, empty form of godliness. Thus the saints may communicate with the wicked so they communicate not with their wickedness....."Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness;" Eph. v. 11. "Be not partaker of other men's sins;" 1 Tim. v. 22.—"Come out of her (Babylon), my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins;" Rev. xviii. 4.....

530. 6. They have communion with *all saints living* in the same Church of Christ. "If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another;" 1 John i. 7. We all have the benefit of the same ordinances, partake of the same promises, are endued with the same graces of the same mutual love, keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, all engrafted into the same stock, and, for receiving life from the same root, all "holding" the same "head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God;" Col. ii. 19.

---

529. In what things have the living saints communion, in what they have not, with men not truly saints?
530. Note particulars, (quoting requisite texts) respecting the communion of all living saints one with another.

531. 7. They are in communion with *all the saints departed** out of this life, and admitted to the presence of God. *Jerusalem* is taken sometimes for the Church on earth, sometimes for that part of the Church which is in heaven, to shew that .....both are but the same city of God. "Ye are come unto.....the heavenly Jerusalem, and an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, &c. and to the spirits of just men made perfect, &c." Heb. xii. 22, 23. Indeed, the communion of saints in the Church of Christ with those departed is demonstrated by their communion with the saints alive.....the foundation of which communion cannot be removed by death. For the mystical union between Christ and His Church, the spiritual conjunction of the members to the head, is the true foundation of that communion which one member hath with another, all the members living and increasing by the same influence which they receive from Him. But death.....makes no separation in this mystical union, &c. consequently, the same foundation remaining, the same communion must continue. Indeed the saint departed had before his death some communion with the hypocrite.....[*see par.* 529.] but such being only in things external, which ceases in the person dead, the hypocrite remaining ceases to have any communion with the saint departing, and the saints surviving with the hypocrite dying. But the true holiness of man, wrought by the Spirit of God, not only remains, but is im-

---

531. Shew that the saints living have communion with all saints departed. How is it that all communion between saints and hypocrites ends on the death of either, but that the communion between saints living and saints departed is still continued? In what do we communicate

* This is that part of the communion of saints which those of the Ancients peculiarly insist on who first took notice of it in the Creed.

proved after death.....by which the saints cannot be divided, since it has no power over that sanctity by which they were first conjoined.———What acts or external operations this fundamental and internal Communion of Saints in heaven and earth produces, is not so certain. *We* communicate with *them* in *hope* of that happiness which *they enjoy—we* have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, consequently have a part of *their* felicity. But what they do in heaven in relation to us, or what we ought to perform in relation to them, beside reverential respect and study of imitation, is not revealed in Scripture, nor to be necessarily concluded from any principles of Christianity. They who first found this clause in the Creed, and delivered their exposition to us, went no further than the society of hope, esteem, and imitation on our side, of desires and supplications on theirs; so that the present interpretation of the Church of Rome is novel as well as unwarrantable. [*See note in Pearson.*]

Practical uses of belief of the Communion of Saints.

532. This belief is necessary: (*a*) To incite us to holiness of life. "if we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowship one with another:" But "if we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie, &c." 1 John i. 6, 7. "For what fellowship hath

---

with the saints departed? Is anything to be proved from Scripture in regard to what the saints in heaven do in relation to us on earth? As to what we ought to perform in reference to them, what is the limit beyond which we have no warrant in Scripture? In regard to what is done by the saints in heaven for us, and what we ought to do in relation to them, how does it appear that the Church of Rome teaches what is new as well as unwarrantable?

532. What are the practical uses of belief of *the Communion of Saints?* Quote texts.

righteousness with unrighteousness, &c." 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15. Christ sent St. Paul to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified".....Acts xxvi. 18. Except we be turned from darkness, &c. we cannot be "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light;" Col. i. 12. There can be no communion where there is no similitude, no fellowship with God without some sanctity.....—(*b*) To stir us up to proportionate gratitude to God, &c. They are "exceeding great and precious promises," by which we become "partakers of the Divine nature;" 2 Pet. i. 4. "What am I?" said David, &c. "that I should be son-in-law to the king?" 1 Sam. xviii. 18. What are we -what are they who are called to be saints, that they should have fellowship with the Father? St. Philip said to Christ, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us;" John xiv. 8. whereas He hath not only shewn us, but come to us with, the Father, and dwelt within us by His Holy Spirit, hath called us to the fellowship of angels, apostles, prophets, martyrs, to the holy Church militant in earth and triumphant in heaven.—(*c*) To inflame our hearts with ardent affection to those saints who live, and a reverent respect toward those who are departed, and now with God.....No conjunction natural (though requiring affection) can be compared with that which is spiritual, no temporal relation with that which is eternal. If similitude of shape, &c. will create kindness, if congruity of manners, &c. will conjoin affections, what should be the mutual love of those who have the image of the same God renewed within them, and are endued with the influences of the same Spirit? And.....certainly the saints dissolved and with Christ, when they have been blessed with a sight of God, &c. may challenge respect from us who are here to wait on the will of God, expecting such a happy change.—(*d*) As tending to direct and enlarge our acts of charity. We are obliged to be charitable to all men, because the love of our brother (*i. e.* in Scripture language whosoever is another) is the foundation of our duty to man; but are particularly directed to them that are of the household of faith.....There is a special reason urging those truly sanctified by the Spirit of God to do good to such as appear to be led by the same Spirit:

for if they communicate with them in the everlasting mercies of God, it is fit they should partake of the bowels of man's compassion.....

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. IX. §. 2.

533. I am fully persuaded of this as a necessary truth, that such persons as are truly sanctified in the Church of Christ, while they live among the crooked generations of men, &c. have fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them: that they partake of the care and kindness of the blessed Angels, who delight in the ministration for their benefit: that *beside* the *external* fellowship which they have in the Word and Sacraments with *all* the *members* of the Church, they have an *intimate* union with *all* the *Saints* on earth, as the living members of Christ: nor is this union separated by the death of any; but as Christ, in whom they live, is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so have they fellowship with all the Saints who from the death of Abel have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and "follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth." Thus I believe THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

ART. X. The Forgiveness of Sins.

534. This Article, always expressly contained in the Creed, for some ages immediately followed the Belief of "the Holy Church," to shew that the *remission of sins* was to be obtained *in the Church of Christ*. For since the Creed at first was made to be used as a confession of such as were to be baptized, declaring their faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in whose baptism they were to be admitted, and "the forgiveness of sins," by the same baptism

---

533. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief of *the Communion of Saints*. 534. What is to be observed as to the antiquity of Article X.? With what preceding clause was it at first immediately connected,

to be obtained, therefore in some Creeds it was particularly expressed, "I believe one baptism for the forgiveness of sins."—Looking thus on this Article,.....it will be necessary for the explication of it

535. I. To declare what is the nature of the Remission of sins: to understand which must be considered

536. 1. What is the *nature* of *sin*. "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law, for *sin is the transgression of the law*," 1 John iii. 4. a *definition* (*strictly* speaking—see Pearson) of *sin*. "The law worketh wrath," (*i. e.* a punishment from God,) "for where no law is there is no transgression;" Rom. iv. 15. The law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is sin: the law of God is pure, and whatsoever is contrary to it is impure. Whatsoever therefore is done by man, or is in man, having any contrariety or opposition to the law of God, is sin. i. Every action, word, thought, against the Law is a sin of *commission*, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and *contrary* to, the prohibition of the Law, or a *negative* precept.—ii. Every *omission* of a duty required of us is a sin, as being *contrary* to the commanding part of the Law, or an *affirmative* precept.—iii. Every *evil habit* contracted in the soul by actions committed against the law of God is a sin constituting a man *truly* a *sinner* even when he *actually sins not*.—iv. Any *corruption* and *inclination* in the soul to do that which God

---

and what is its sense as shewn by that connection? 535, 543. What is required for the explication of the Article thus understood? 536. Shew, quoting requisite texts, what is the *nature* of sin. How may sin be distinguished in respect of *commission*, *omission*, *evil habit*, and *evil inclination*?

forbids, or omit that which He commands, howsoever such corruption, &c. came into that soul,.....is a sin, as being somewhat dissonant and repugnant to the Law of God.

537. 2. What is the *obligation* of *sin*. Every sin causes a guilt,...which *guilt* consists in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the sin. Laws in general are attended with rewards propounded for the observation of them, and punishment threatened on the deviation from them. And though there were no penal threats accompanying the laws of God, yet the transgression of them would make the transgressor worthy of, and liable to, whatsoever punishment can justly be inflicted for that sin committed. *Sins* of *commission pass away* in the acting of them :.....*Sins* of *omission pass away* when the time is passed in which the affirmative precept obliged to performance :..... But though the *sin itself* do *pass away* together with the time in which it was committed, yet the *guilt* thereof doth *never* pass which by committing it was contracted.....—This debt or obligation to punishment not only necessarily results from the nature of sin,...and is not only *generally* delivered in the Scriptures revealing the wrath of God against all unrighteousness, but is yet more *particularly* represented in the word which teacheth us, if we do ill, how "sin lieth at the door." Christ taught His disciples, "Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the

---

537. What is the *obligation* of sin? Shew the difference between *sins*, whether of commission or omission, and the *guilt* contracted by them, in respect of *duration*. Shew from Scripture that a sinner's *obligation* to *eternal* punishment *is*, or *is not*, *taken off*, according as, respectively,

judgment: &c. but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be liable (obnoxious, &c.) to hell fire;" Matt. v. 22. So again, "All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme. But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is liable (obnoxious, &c.) to eternal damnation;" Mark iii. 28, 29. Whence appears clearly the *guilt* of sin, and *obligation* to *eternal* punishment, if there be *no remission*, or forgiveness of it; and the *taking off* that *obligation*, &c. if there *be* such *remission*, &c.....

538. 3. What is the *Forgiveness* of *sin*.—This at first appears to be an act of God towards a sinner, because the sin was committed against the law of God, consequently the punishment is due from Him. But *how* God doth forgive a sinner is not so easy to determine. It cannot be concluded out of the *words* themselves which express it.....for the word used in the Creed for *Remission* (ἄφεσις), though it (and ἀφίεναι) be used in one sense which may seem proper for this particular concernment, yet has many other senses; and even when used in reference to the forgiveness of sins, yet it has *not always* the same *particular* notion, *i. e.* of releasing a debt—it corresponds to different Hebrew words conveying different notions in respect of the forgiveness of sins. [*See Pearson.*] The true notion of forgiveness of sins therefore is rather to be understood by consideration of all the ways, &c. used by God in the working, &c. of it, than by any word made use of to express it.

---

there *is*, or *is not remission* of sins. 538. Whose act is the forgiveness of sins? What is the Greek word used in the Creed to express "forgiveness?" Shew that the true nature of forgiveness of sins cannot be sufficiently ascertained by consideration of any *word* used to express it: how therefore must we proceed to ascertain it?

539. It must then first be observed that "almost all things *by the Law* were *purged with blood*, and *without shedding of blood* there is *no remission*;" Heb. ix. 22.—And what was then *legally* done was but a *type* of what was to be performed by *Christ:* therefore *His blood* must be involved in the *remission of sins;* for He "once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself;" ix. 26.—It must then be acknowledged...that *Christ* did *suffer* a painful and shameful *death*.....—that this death He did then suffer *for sin;* for "this man offered one sacrifice for sins;" x. 12.—that the *sins* for which He suffered ".....the just for the unjust," 1 Pet. iii. 18. were *not His own;* "He was holy, harmless, &c." Heb. vii. 26.....but *ours*, for "He was wounded for our transgressions, &c." Isai. liii. 5. "He was delivered for our offences, gave Himself for our sins, died for our sins according to the Scriptures;" Rom. iv. 25; Gal. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 3.—that the dying for our sins was suffering death as a *punishment taken on Himself to free us from the punishment due to our sins;* for "God laid on Him the iniquity of us all," Isai. liii. 6. (and see 4.) "and made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin;" 2 Cor. v. 21.—that by His *thus* suffering for *that end*, it comes to pass that *our sins are forgiven;* for, "This is my blood," saith He, "of the New Testament, (or covenant,) which is shed for many for the remission of sins;" Matt. xxvi. 28. "In Christ we have redemption through His

---

539. [Observe Pearson's *arrangement* of the series of truths contained in this paragraph.] Shew from Scripture the necessary connection, in fulfilment of legal types, of Christ's death with the remission of sins; the vicarious nature, and the intent of His sufferings; and the consequent accomplishment of the forgiveness of our sins. In reference to God as *offended*, and as *just*, what two main

blood, the forgiveness of sins, &c." Eph. i. 7.—In which series of truths we perceive that "the forgiveness of sins" promised us, and which we on that promise believe, contains A. a *reconciliation* to an *offended* God, and B. a *satisfaction* to a *just* God.

540. A. Christ by His death hath *reconciled* God to us, who, before offended by our sins, on the consideration of Christ's death becomes propitious to us, and did ordain Christ's death to be a propitiation for us. For we are "justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood;" Rom. iii. 24, 25. "We have an Advocate with the Father, and He is the propitiation for our sins." For "God loved us, and sent His Son to be a propitiation for our sins," 1 John ii. 1, 2; iv. 10...This propitiation amounted to a *reconciliation*, i. e. kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God, essentially just and necessarily abominating iniquity, was angry with mankind before He determined to give our Saviour.....He indeed "so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son," John iii. 16., yet there is no incongruity in this, that a father should be offended with that son whom he loveth, and even when he loveth him. Notwithstanding therefore God loveth men whom He created, yet was He offended with them when they sinned, and gave His Son to suffer for them,

---

particulars, respectively, are contained in "the forgiveness of sins?" 540. Shew from Scripture that Christ by His death reconciled God to man. What is meant by *reconciliation*? Shew that God's anger against men was not incongruous with His love for them. The Socinians object that Scripture says Christ reconciled men to God, but not that He reconciled God to man: shew the futility of this objection.

that through that Son's obedience He might be reconciled to them.—This reconciliation is clearly delivered in Scripture as wrought by Christ: For "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ;" 2 Cor. v. 18.—by virtue of His death, for "when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of His Son, making peace through the blood of His cross, and by Him reconciling all things unto Himself;" Rom. v. 10; Col. i. 20.—It is vainly objected by the Socinians that Scripture saith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but nowhere teaches that He reconciled God to man; for *in Scripture language* to *reconcile* a *man to God is* in our vulgar language to *reconcile God to man*, i. e. to cause Him who before was angry with him to be propitious unto him *e. g. α.* The Philistine princes spake of David, "Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master?" 1 Sam. xxix. 4. *i. e.* reconcile (render favourable to himself) Saul, so highly offended with him. *β.* Our Saviour advises, "If thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there remember that thy brother hath ought against thee,.....first be reconciled to thy brother;" Matt. v. 23, 24. *i. e.* reconcile thy brother, whom thou hast injured, to thyself. *γ.* S. Paul advises the wife that "departeth from her husband, to remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband," 1 Cor. vii. 11. *i. e.* or appease, and get the favour of, her husband.

541. B. The punishment which Christ as our surety endured was a full *satisfaction* to the will and justice of God. "The Son of man came.....to give His life a ransom for many;" Matt. xx. 28. Now a *ransom* is a price given to redeem such as are in captivity, any thing laid down by way of compensation, to take off a bond or obligation, whereby he who before was bound becomes free. All sinners

---

541. Shew, quoting requisite Scriptures, that Christ by His death made *satisfaction* to God for our sins. What is meant by a *ransom?* Why is the death of Christ of sufficient value to be a *full* satisfaction for our sins?

were obliged to undergo punishments proportionate to their sins, and were thus captivated in bonds, and Christ gave his life a proper *ransom* for them ....." Ye are bought with a price ;" 1 Cor. vi. 20 ; vii. 23.—it is "the *Lord* who *bought* us," 2 Pet. ii. 1.—and the *price* paid was *His blood*, for "we are not redeemed with corruptible things, &c. but with the precious blood of Christ ;" 1 Pet. i. 18.—which was a *full* and *perfect satisfaction*. For as the gravity of the offence is augmented according to the dignity of the person offended, so is the value of what is given as compensation according to the dignity of the giver. God is of infinite majesty, against whom we have sinned, and Christ is of the same Divinity, who gave His life a ransom for sinners, for "God" hath "purchased" His "Church with His own blood ;" Acts xx. 28.

542. Summary. 1. Man, owing absolute obedience to the law of God, who hath sovereign dominion over him, whensoever he transgresses that law becomes a sinner ; and 2. contracts a guilt which is an obligation to endure a punishment proportionable to his offence : and God, wronged and offended, hath a most just right to punish him. But 3. Christ taking on Him the nature of man, and offering Himself a sacrifice for sin, giveth that to God instead of the eternal death of man, which is more valuable and acceptable, and so makes sufficient compensation and full satisfaction for the sins of man ; which God accepting becomes reconciled to us, and for the punishment which Christ endured takes off our obligation to eternal punishment ;.....and in this act of God consists "the forgiveness of sins."

543. II. To shew 1. how the forgiveness of sins is propounded in the Church ; and 2. how it may be procured by the members of the Church.

544. 1. When our Saviour sent the Apostles to

---

542. Describe, by a summary of what has been said under I. 1, 2, 3, in what the *forgiveness* of sins consists.
544. Shew, quoting requisite Scriptures, that remission of sins was to be obtained in the Church of Christ, and

gather a Church to Him, He foretold "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, &c." Luke xxiv. 47. and when the Church was first constituted, they exhorted those whom they desired to come into it, "Repent, &c. that your sins may be blotted out;" Acts iii. 19. "Through this man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins;" xiii. 38. Whence it appears that the Jews and Gentiles were invited to the Church of Christ that they might *therein* receive *remission of sins;* that the doctrine of such remission was *proper and peculiar to the Gospel:* ....."By Christ all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses;" xiii. 39. Therefore John the Baptist, who went "before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways, gave knowledge of salvation unto His people by the remission of their sins;" Luke i. 76, 77.....The *Law itself*, strictly considered, promised life only on *perfect obedience;* "Do this and live." Some of the greater sins therein specified had annexed to them the sentence (irreversible) of death, nor was there any other way left in the Law of Moses by which that punishment might be taken off. For other less sins sacrifices were appointed, which being offered and accepted, God was appeased, and the offences released. Whatsoever else we read of sins forgiven under the Law was of some special Divine indulgence,.....something of the Gospel was mingled with the Law.—Now the atonement made by the sacrifices clearly had relation to the death of

---

that the doctrine of such remission is peculiar to the Gospel. Shew that the Law of Moses did not so propound it as does the Gospel. By virtue of what only did remission of sins, even before it was clearly revealed, *at any time* take effect?

the Messias. *All* atonements indeed ever made were only effectual—no sin was ever forgiven but —by the blood of the Lamb "slain from the foundation of the world :" But the general doctrine of remission of sins was never clearly revealed and publicly preached to all nations till the coming of the Saviour of the world, called *Jesus*, because He was to "*save* His people from their sins ;" Matt. i. 21.

545. 2. How remission of sins is procured by any person in the Church—is to be considered (*a*) As to the *initiation* of a Christian. All sins whatsoever any person is previously guilty of are remitted in his *baptism*. "Forgiveness of sins" was promised to all baptized in the name of Christ; and undoubtedly all persons who performed all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of baptism also received the benefit of it, "remission of sins." "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins ;" Mark i. 4. St. Peter made this the exhortation of his first sermon, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins ;" Acts ii. 38. Vainly therefore would Socinus attribute the remission either to repentance without consideration of baptism, or to public profession of faith in baptism, or would attribute, if any thing, nothing but a declaration of such remission to baptism itself. These shifts agree not with what Ananias said to Saul, without mention of repentance or confession, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins ;" Acts xxii. 16., nor with what

---

545. How is remission of sins *first* to be procured in the Church—(notice and refute some erroneous statements of Socinus connected with this point)—and how *subsequently ?* Quote requisite texts. Whose was the heresy

St. Paul, so baptized, hath taught us concerning the Church, that Christ doth "sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water;" Eph. v. 26. Baptism then, as instituted by Christ after the pre-administration of St. John, wheresoever received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administering, was infallibly efficacious as to the remission of all sins previously committed.—(*b*) As to the *continuation* of a Christian. Members of the Church receive remission of sins committed after baptism by *repentance.* Christ in His pattern of prayer hath taught us ever to beg the forgiveness of our sins.....In this life.....while the allurements of the world, the stratagems of Satan, the infirmities and corruptions of our nature, betray us to the trangression of the law of God, we are always subject to offend, (whosoever "saith he hath no sin is a liar;" 1 John i. 8.,) and may always apply ourselves to God by repentance, and be renewed by His grace, and pardoned by His mercy.....To deny the Church the power of absolution on repentance is the heresy of Novatian.*

Practical uses of Belief of the Forgiveness of Sins.

546. This belief is necessary: (*a*) Because there can be no Christian consolation without it. We have all sinned .....are guilty.....therefore obliged to endure eternal

---

(when promulgated?) of denying that repentance was available to the forgiveness of sins after baptism? 546. What are the practical uses of belief of *the forgiveness of sins?* Quote texts.

* So Pearson would call this heresy, as rather springing from Novatianus the Roman presbyter than from Novatus the African bishop, though both joined in it. [In the third century.] He acknowledged but one repentance, which was available in baptism, after which if any man sinned, there was no mercy remaining for him.

punishment from the wrath of God.....whence a fearful expectation of everlasting misery. So long as guilt remaineth on the soul of man, so long is he in the condition of the devils, "delivered into chains, and reserved unto judgment;" 2 Pet. ii. 4. We all fell as well as they, but.....remission of sins is promised to us, not to them.—(*b*) That we may sufficiently esteem God's goodness and our happiness. When man was fallen into sin, he could not work out his own recovery, &c. There can be nothing within him to move God not to shew a demonstration of His justice upon him, nothing without him to rescue him from the sentence of an offended and Almighty God.....God dispenseth with His law, taketh off the guilt, &c. This is God's goodness, man's happiness. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, &c." Psal. xxxii. 1, 2.....—(*c*) To inflame us with the love of God....."There was a certain creditor which had two debtors; the one owed him five hundred pence, the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both;" Luke vii. 41, 42. On which case our Saviour asks, "which of them will love him most?".....and collects that the love will be proportionate to the debt forgiven. We are the debtors, our debts are sins, the creditor is God; the remission of our sins is a frank forgiving of our debts, and for that we must return our love.—(*d*) To teach us what we owe to Christ.....He rendered God propitious to us, because He gave Himself as a satisfaction for our sins. We then "are not our own" who are "bought with a price;" we must "glorify God in our bodies and in our spirits, which are God's;" 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.....we are "the servants of Christ, who are bought with a price;" vii. 23. (*e*) To remind us, believing remission of sins wrought by the blood of Christ, by which the *covenant* was ratified, of a *condition* required;.....if we look for forgiveness promised, we must perform repentance commanded. These two were always preached together. Christ did truly appear to be "a Prince and a Saviour,' and it was "to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins;" Acts v. 31. He appointed "repentance and remission of sins to be preached in His name, &c." Luke xxiv. 47.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. X.

547. I acknowledge and embrace this as a most necessary truth that, whereas every sin is a transgression of the law of God, on every transgression there remains on the transgressor a guilt, which is an obligation to endure eternal punishment, so that all men being concluded under sin, were all under this obligation; that it pleased God to give His Son, and His Son to give Himself to be a surety for this debt, and release us from these bonds; and because without shedding of blood there is no remission, He gave His life a sacrifice for sin, laid it down as a ransom, even His precious blood as a price by way of compensation and satisfaction to the will and justice of God, by which propitiation God, by our sins offended, became reconciled, and took off our obligation to eternal punishment, which is the guilt of our sins; and appointed in the Church of Christ the Sacrament of Baptism for the first remission, and Repentance for the constant forgiveness of all following trespasses. Thus I believe THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

ART. XI. The Resurrection of the Body.

548. This article was anciently delivered by all Churches, thus, "the resurrection of the flesh," with the only difference that the Church of Aquileia propounded it, more particularly, "the resurrection of *this* flesh." Our English Creed has "body," though neither the Greek nor Latin ever so delivered it, but "flesh," avoiding any possible ambiguity in relation to *celestial* and *spiritual bodies*. But yet we agree with the ancient Creeds; for as by "flesh" they understood

---

547. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief of *the Forgiveness of Sins*. 548. What was the only verbal difference in the delivery of the Article concerning the Resurrection of the flesh by the ancient Churches? How does our Creed *verbally* differ here from the ancient Creed? Shew, by quoting an illustrative passage from the services of our Church, that no difference of *doctrine* is intended.

the body of man, and no other flesh, so we translating it "*body*," understand no other body but such a body of flesh, of the same frail, &c. nature, as it had before it was by death separated from the soul.....Our Church has taken care to shew this :...in the form of public baptism the godfathers are asked,....."Dost thou believe..... the resurrection of the *flesh?*"

549. When the Resurrection of *Christ* was treated of, the proper notion and nature of resurrection *in general* was delivered. It remains here therefore only to consider, What is the resurrection to come, who they are that shall be raised, how we are assured that they shall rise, and in what manner all shall be performed.

550. I. There shall be a Resurrection *of the body.*—*This* resurrection has some peculiar difficulties different from those which might seem to obstruct the belief of *Christ's* resurrection. For the body of the Son of God never saw corruption ; all its parts continued in the same condition in which they were when His soul had left them ;.....But other mortal bodies, after the soul has deserted them, are left to all the sad effects of their mortality,..Our whole tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into dust, &c. and confounded with the dust of the earth. In the kind of resurrection described, Ezek. xxxvii. 7, &c. is supposed "a valley full of dry bones,...the bones came together,...the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, &c." But in the resurrection to come, we cannot suppose the bones in the valley, they being themselves dissolved into dust. It must

---

549. Under what Article of the Creed has the proper notion of Resurrection in *general* been considered? What points remain here to be treated of? 550. What peculiar difficulties attend the resurrection now under consideration different from those which might seem to obstruct belief of the Resurrection of Christ?

therefore be shewn that the bodies of men, howsoever corrupted, wheresoever in their parts dispersed, how long soever dead, shall hereafter be re-collected in themselves, and united to their own souls. In order to which it must be proved

551. 1. That such a resurrection is *not* in itself *impossible.*

552. Philosophers of old looked on the resurrection of the body as impossible, though some thought the *souls* of the dead lived again. "Certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics.....when they heard of the resurrection mocked him (St. Paul) &c." Acts xvii. But as the ancient philosophers thought a creation impossible, because they looked only on the constant works of nature, [*see. par.* 71. &c.,] so they thought a resurrection of corrupted &c. bodies as impossible, because they could never observe any action or operation in nature which did or could produce such effect. But *we*...estimating things possible and impossible by the *power* of *God*, will easily prove such a resurrection *possible*. *If* the resurrection of the dead be *impossible*, it must be so either

553. A. In respect of the *Agent:* in which case the impossibility must arise from a want in him either (*a*) of knowledge what is to be done, or (*b*) of power to do it. But "with *God*," to whom we attribute the resurrection, "nothing is impossible;" Luke i. 37.

554. (*a*) His understanding is infinite. He knoweth all men which ever lived or shall live, knoweth whereof all things were made, from what "dust we came," to what "dust we shall return." "Our

---

551, 557, 561. What must be shewn in proof that there will be a resurrection of the body? 552. What difference of opinion existed among ancient philosophers in respect of another life in regard of the *soul?* What was their general opinion (on what grounded?) as to the possibility of a resurrection of the *body?* Quote a passage from the Acts in illustration. 553, 554. Shew that the Resurrection is not impossible, in reference to the Agent to whom we ascribe it, on the ground of deficiency of *knowledge.*

substance was not hid from Him when we were made in secret, &c." Psal. cxxxix. 15, 16. Every particle of our body is known to Him that made us. The generation of our flesh is clearly seen by the "Father of spirits;" Heb. xii. 9. the augmentation of it known to Him "in whom we live and move and have our being;" Acts xvii. 28. the dissolution of our tabernacles perceived by that God by whom the "very hairs of our head are all numbered," and "without whom one sparrow shall not fall to the ground;" Matt. x. 29, 30. He who numbers the sands of the sea knows all the scattered bones, &c. knows what dust belongs to each body, what body to each soul. Again,... He also sees and knows all ways and means by which these scattered parts should be re-united, &c. knows how every bone should be brought to its old neighbour-bone, how every sinew may be re-embroidered on it, what are the proper parts, and by what gluten, to be conjoined. The Resurrection therefore *cannot* be *impossible* in relation to the *Agent* on any *deficiency* of *knowledge*.

555. (*b*) His power is unlimited. There can be no opposition made against Him, because all power is His;...all creatures must do as well as suffer what He will have them. [*See par.* 409.] There is no atom of the dust or ashes but must be where it pleases God, and be applied and make up what and how it seems good to Him. The Resurrection therefore *cannot* be *impossible* in relation to the *Agent* on any *deficiency* of *power*.

556. or, B. In relation to the *patient*:—but when we look on the power of God, nothing can be impossible but what involves a contradiction; [*see par.* 410.;] and there can be no contradiction in this, that he which was, and now is not, should

---

553, 555. Nor of deficiency of *power*. 556. Shew that it is not impossible in reference to the *patient*.

hereafter be what before he was.....As no creature could be made out of nothing but by Him, so can it not be reduced to nothing but by the same; though therefore the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not...it is no more a contradiction that they should become parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, than that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they do. Howsoever scattered, wheresoever lodged, they are within the knowledge and power of God, and can have no repugnancy by their separation to be re-united when and how He pleaseth.....If it be not easier it is certainly as easy to make that to be again which once hath been, as to make that to be which before was not. When there was no man, God made him of the earth, and therefore when he returns to earth, the same God can make him man again.—The resurrection therefore *cannot* be *impossible* in relation to the *patient*.

557. 2. That the Resurrection is highly *probable*.

558. (*a*) If we consider...the parts of which we all consist, we cannot conceive this present life proportionable to our composition. The souls of men, as they are immaterial, so they are immortal; and being once created by the Father of spirits they receive a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his spirit, and a man born into this world consists of these two. Now the life of the most aged person is but short, and many far ignobler creatures are of a longer duration,.....Can we think that such material and mortal, that such inunderstanding souls, should be furnished with bodies of so long permansion, and our spirits joined to flesh so suddenly dissolvible, were it not that *they* lived but once, and so enjoyed that life for a longer season.....? whereas this is not the only life belonging

---

558. Shew that the Resurrection is highly *probable* from consideration of the parts of which man consists, and the shortness of his life in this world as compared with that of many inferior creatures.

to man, and so the immortal soul may at a shorter warning leave the body which it shall resume.

559. (*b*) We, men, are free agents, therefore capable of doing good or evil, consequently ordinable to reward or punishment. The angels who are *above* us, and did sin, receive their punishment without a death, because subject, being only spirits, to no other dissolution than annihilation, which cannot consist with longer suffering punishment; those who continued in their station were rewarded and confirmed to all eternity: thus all the angels are incapable of a resurrection. The creatures which are *below* us, and for want of freedom cannot act any thing morally good or evil, cannot deserve after this life to be punished or rewarded; therefore when they die, they continue in the state of death for ever...But man by the nobleness of his better part being free to do what is good or evil while he lives, and by the frailty of his body being subject to death, and yet after that being capable to receive a reward or punishment for what he hath done well or ill in the flesh, must rise from the dead to enjoy the one, or suffer the other. For there is not, nay cannot be, just retribution rendered in this life to man. For it may, and often does, happen, that one man may commit sins to which all the punishments in this life would be by no means equivalent.....What death can sufficiently retaliate for the many murders committed by one notorious pirate? &c. &c. What is then more proper considering the providence of a most just God, than to believe that man shall suffer in another

---

559. Also from consideration of man's capability of doing moral good or evil, and his consequent liability to reward or punishment. Why are angels incapable of a resurrection? Why will there be no resurrection of the creatures inferior to man? Why would it not be reasonable to think that the *soul alone* of a sinner was to undergo sufferings in a future life?

life punishments proportionable to his demerits? Nor can we with reason think that the soul alone shall undergo those sufferings, because the laws which were given us.....have most frequent reflection on the body, without which in this life the soul can neither do nor suffer any thing. It is therefore highly probable.....that.....there shall be a "resurrection of the flesh, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad;" 2 Cor. v. 10.

560. (*c*) The consideration of the natural course of variations in the creature will render the resurrection yet more highly probable.—*α*. In every 24 hours the day dies into a night, &c., next morning it revives, opening the grave of darkness; &c. a diurnal resurrection.—*β*. Summer dies into winter; the sap is said to descend into the root, and there it lies buried in the ground, &c. when spring appears, all begin to rise; the plants, &c. revive and grow; &c. an annual resurrection. *γ*. The corn is.....buried in the ground that it may corrupt, and being corrupted may revive and multiply; our bodies are fed with this constant experiment, and we continue this present life by a succession of resurrections.—...Can we think that man, the lord of all these things which thus die and revive for him, should be detained in death for ever—that God should thus restore all things to man, and not man to himself?...

561. 3. Further, that the Resurrection is *certain* Of this indeed we can only be assured by the revelation of the will of God; from His *power* we must conclude that we *may*, from His *will* that we *shall*, rise from the dead. Now God hath revealed (to us) His will to raise the dead.

562. A. God hath revealed this intention in His word.

---

560. Shew that the Resurrection is highly *probable* from analogies presented in the course of external nature. 561. How only can we be assured that there *certainly* will be a Resurrection? 562, 563. Shew that God hath revealed, even in the Old Testament, His intention to raise the dead. "I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c." Job

563. (*a*) In the Old Testament; though many of the places thence produced to this purpose will scarce amount to a revelation of this truth. i. The Jews insist on such weak inferences out of the Law as shew that the Resurrection was *not clearly* delivered by Moses; while, because they will not understand the true notion of a Redeemer, belonging to Christ, they acknowledge not the resurrection ii. in the book of Job, where it is most evidently expressed; "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God;" xix. 25, 26. Against the evidence of this truth are two interpretations; *a.* one, very new, of some who understand this of a sudden restitution to Job's former temporal condition:—But this consists not with what precedes, "O that my words were now written!.....graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever!" He desires that his words may continue as long as his expectation.....may remain in the rock so long as it shall endure, even to the day of his resurrection. Also, in answer to his friends' objection that he was a sinner, and therefore should never rise again, for his sins he pleads a Redeemer, and through the same shews assurance for his resurrection. And as to his expressions themselves, "I also know" denotes a *certainty* (*I know*) inapplicable to the blessings of *this* life, and a *community* (*also* ואני — the hope of the resurrection belongs to all believers in God,) whereas Job's *temporal* condition admitted no community. The title which he gives to him on whom he depends, the "Redeemer," shews that he under-

---

xix. 25, 26. Give Pearson's explication of this passage, and refutation of interpretations (what?) adverse to the conclusion of a future resurrection from it.

stands it of Christ; the time expressed denotes the futurition at "the latter day;" the description of that Redeemer, "standing on the earth," represents the Judge of the quick and the dead; and "seeing God" with his eyes denotes his belief of the incarnation.—*β*. The other, more ancient, opposing interpretation, is that of the Jews, who would make him speak of the happiness of *another life without* reference to a *resurrection*, which exposition fails only in this, that they will not see in this place the promised Messias, whence this future happy condition would clearly involve a resurrection.—iii. However, they acknowledge the words of Daniel to declare as much, "and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame, &c." xii. 2.

564. (*b*) In the New Testament; *fully*. i. Christ, who called Himself "the resurrection and the life," refuted the Sadducees out of the law of Moses, thus, "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, &c.? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living;" Matt. xxii. 31, 32..... God — under which name was understood a great benefactor, &c.—after the death of Abraham, &c. desiring *still* to be called their God, thereby acknowledges that He had a blessing and reward for them still, consequently that He will raise them, (who had not received the promises [*i. e.* things promised]), to *another* life, in which they may receive it.—The Jews have drawn

---

562, 564. Shew that God hath *fully* revealed in the New Testament His intention to raise the dead. "I am the God of Abraham, &c." Exod. iii. 6. What is the force of our Saviour's argument hence in proof of a resurrection? Notice another passage of the Pentateuch whence the Jews have drawn (how?) a similar argument.

a similar argument from another place of Moses : "……I have established My covenant with them, (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,) to give *them* the land of Canaan, &c." Exod. vi. 3, 4.—therefore because while they *lived here* they enjoyed it *not*, they must live again that they may receive the promise.—ii. St. Paul, when called before the council, perceiving that the one part were Sadducees, denying, the other Pharisees, asserting, the resurrection, "cried out in the council,……I am a Pharisee,…of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question :" Acts xxiii. 6. See also xxiv. 20, 21.—[Pearson appears to have thought it unnecessary here to multiply quotations from the New Testament asserting the Resurrection.]

565. B. God hath confirmed our faith in His revealed intention by *examples* of a resurrection.

566. (*a*) Three instances under the Law.—i. The child of the widow of Sarepta, raised by Elijah ; 1 Kings xvii.—ii. The child of the Shunamite, raised by Elisha ; 2 Kings iv.—iii. The dead man who revived when he was let down into the sepulchre of Elisha, and touched his bones ; 2 Kings xiii.

567. (*b*) Three instances to equal them under the Gospel.—i. The daughter of Jairus. Mark v. ; Luke viii.—ii. The son of the widow of Nain. Luke vii.—iii. Lazarus, even when four days dead, &c. John xi.

568. C. God hath further confirmed our faith by the resurrection of Christ Himself ; which not only proves by way of *example* (—"if Christ be

---

565, 566. Shew that God hath confirmed our faith in the resurrection by examples already given of a resurrection. Give three such examples under the Law. 567. Give three such examples (of persons raised by Christ) under the Gospel. 568. Shew that God hath moreover confirmed our faith in the resurrection in a peculiar manner, *beyond* that of *example*, by the resurrection of Christ.

preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is *no* resurrection of the dead?" 1 Cor. xv. 12.—) but has a *force* in it to *command belief* of, a future general resurrection. For God hath "appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given an assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead;" Acts xvii. 31....."As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;' 1 Cor. xv. 20. &c.—This consequence of a resurrection of the dead from that of Christ concerns

569. (*a*) *Generally, all men*;—i. In respect of that dominion of which Christ at His resurrection obtained full possesion and execution.—*α*. He "both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living;" Rom. xiv. 9.....Now He is not the Lord of the dead, as dead, (compare Matt. xii. 32.) but as by His power He can revive them, and rule them when they live.—*β*. By virtue of this dominion "He must reign till He hath put all His enemies under His feet," and "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death;" 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26. which can only be destroyed by a general resurrection. See Rev. i. 18.—ii. In respect of the judgment to follow. For as "it is appointed for all men once to die, so after death cometh judgment;" Heb. ix. 27.....As God gave an assurance to all men that He would judge the world by Christ in that He raised Him from the dead, so by the same act did He give an assurance of the resurrection of the world to judgment.

---

569. In what two respects does the consequence of a future resurrection as deduced from that of Christ concern all men in general?

570. (*b*) *Peculiarly, the chosen saints and servants of God.* For Christ is risen not only as their Lord and Judge, but as their *Head;* "He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is the first-born from the dead;" Col. i. 18.—as the *first-fruits*, by which all the lump is sanctified, &c.; "now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept;" 1 Cor. xv. 20....."If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us," (as in the saints He doth,) "He that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in us;" Rom. viii. 11.

571. II. The Resurrection shall be *of the same body* which had lived and was dead.....If either the same body should be joined to another soul, or the same soul to another body, it would *not* be the resurrection of the *same man.* Now the *soul* is so eminent a part of man, and, by our Saviour's testimony, not subject to mortality, that.....there is no question but the *same souls* shall live the second life which have lived the first. This must also be made good of our *bodies:*.....The *same body*, not any other, shall be raised to life which died; the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day.

572. 1. This is evident out of the *same word*, on the *same grounds*, on which we believe there shall

---

570. How does it peculiarly concern the chosen servants of God? 571. What diversity at the resurrection of either part of man from such part as existing in this life would be inconsistent with the identity of the man raised? What is unquestioned what is to be proved as to the identity of both parts respectively at the resurrection with both as existing in this life? 572. Shew that from Scripture we have the same grounds for believing the identity of the rising with the dying body as for believing that there will be *any* resurrection.

be *any resurrection.* "……In my flesh ('*in flesh*' shewing the reality, 'in *my* flesh' the propriety and identity,) shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another or a "stranger" eye. Job xix. 26, 27. "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies;" Rom. viii. 11. *after* the resurrection our glorified bodies shall become spiritual and incorruptible, but *in* the resurrection of our mortal bodies those bodies, by reason of whose mortality we died, shall be revived. "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, &c." 1 Cor. xv. 53...The soul then, at the resurrection of that man which is made immortal, must put on that body which putteth on incorruption and immortality.

573. 2. The very *name* of the *resurrection* includes the identity of the body raised from death. (*a*) For at the death of a man nothing *falleth* but his *body;* the "spirit goeth upward," Eccles. iii. 21. and *no other body* falleth (at his death) but his own; therefore the *body*, and *no other* but *that* body, must *rise* again to make a resurrection. (*b*) Or, if we look on the resurrection under the notion of *reviviscency*, (which is more ordinary in the Hebrew language,) nothing properly *dies* but the *body*,……and nothing can *revive* but that which dies;……therefore man can only be said to *revive* in reference to his body deprived before of life; and...because no other body at his death died but his own, he cannot revive but in his own body.

574. 3. The description of *the place whence* the

---

573. Shew the identity of the body as implied in the very term *Resurrection*, according to either of the two (what?) notions under which it may be regarded. 574. Shew the same identity from the description given in Scripture of the place whence the resurrection shall begin.

resurrection shall begin is a sufficient assurance of the identity of the bodies that shall rise. They which "sleep in the dust of the earth," Dan. xii. 2. they which "are in the graves," John v. 28. shall rise; "The sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and the grave deliver up the dead which are in them;" Rev. xx. 13. But if the same bodies did not rise, they which are in the dust should not revive; and neither the sea nor grave should give up their dead; for they have nothing to give up but the bodies laid in them.

575. 4. The *immediate consequent* of the *resurrection* proves the identity of the dying and rising body. "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, &c." 2 Cor. v. 10..... That which shall receive the reward for the good, and be liable to punishment for the evil, done in the body, is not only the soul, but the body: it were not therefore a just retribution that he which sinned in one body should be punished in another, that he which pleased God in his own flesh should see God with other eyes. As for the wicked, God shall "destroy their body and soul in hell;" Matt. x. 28. but they which "glorify God both in their body and their spirit, which are God's," 1 Cor. vi. 20. shall be glorified by God in their body and in their spirit: for they are *both* "bought" with the same "price," the blood of Christ. Their bodies are "members of Christ," consequently shall not remain in death,—"temples of the Holy Ghost," consequently if destroyed shall be raised again.—*See* Rom. viii. 11. [*quoted par*, 570.]

---

575. Also from the immediate consequent (—what?—) of the resurrection.

576. 5. The identity of the dying and rising body will appear by those bodies which shall never rise because they shall never die. This may be considered not only in the translation of Enoch and Elijah, but also in those whom Christ shall find alive at His coming, whom He shall not kill, but change; 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. [*See par.* 438.] If those which are alive shall be caught up as they are alive with the same bodies, only changed into glorified and spiritual bodies, *i. e.* with the same bodies spiritualized and glorified, certainly those which were dead shall rise in the same bodies with which they lived, that they may both appear *alike* before the Judge of quick and dead.

577. 6. The identity of the dying and rising body is confirmed by the *examples* which have been given of a *resurrection*. The three examples of the Old Testament, the three of the New, all rose in the same body before it was dissolved; and as to those who rose on our Saviour's death,..... "many bodies of saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves," Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. certainly the same bodies that were laid in. Being examples to us of the resurrection to come, they must resemble in their substance after they lived again, the substance in which all the rest shall rise. And since Christ Himself raised His own body, according to His prediction, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," John ii. 19. and declared it to be His own body, saying, "Behold My hands, &c. that it is I Myself," Luke xxiv. 39. and since He "shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto His

---

576. Also from what will appear by those bodies which never dying shall never rise. Instance them. 577. Also from all the examples which have been given of a resurrection.

glorious body," Phil. iii. 21. therefore we shall rise in the same bodies as our Saviour did.....

578. Conclusion. The bodies which have lived and died, shall live again after death; whatsoever alteration shall be made shall be not of their nature but condition, not of their substance but qualities. Which explication is most agreeable to the language of Scripture, the principles of religion, the constant profession of the Church, against the Origenists of old, and the Socinians of late.

579. III. The Resurrection belongs *to all mankind.* —Here we find a great difference between the revelation of this truth under the Law and under the Gospel.

580. 1. Christ proved out of *the Law* that there should be a resurrection, but by an argument reaching no further than to the people of God; "I am the God of Abraham, &c." Job speaks expressly of the resurrection, but mentions only his Redeemer and himself. [Yet compare what is said in reference to "I *also* know;" *par.* 563.] That most evident place in Daniel, though it deliver two different sorts of persons rising, yet it seems to be with some limitation; "*Many*"—it is not written *all*—"that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake;" whence the Jews most generally have believed that some men shall live again, some not; nay some of them have maintained that ".....the Resurrection of the dead is of the just alone."

581. 2. Against which two restrictions we shall by the light of *the Gospel* deliver the Article in this latitude: the resurrection of the dead belongs

---

578. Against whom is maintained the identity of the rising with the formerly dying body? 579, 580. With respect to the Resurrection as belonging to all men, and the difference to be observed as to the revelation of this truth under the Law and under the Gospel, shew the extent of what may be proved from the Old Testament. Notice some Jewish opinions on this subject. 581, 582. Shew that the New Testament clearly reveals that the

582. (*a*) *Not* to the *just alone, but* to the *unjust also.* The words indeed of Daniel prove it sufficiently; for of those "many" which "shall awake, some" shall "rise to everlasting life, and some to shame, &c." But the just shall never rise "to shame, &c."; evidently therefore some shall rise beside the just. The Jews themselves so believed;....."I have hope," says St. Paul, "which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust;" Acts xxiv. 15.....As there is a resurrection of the just, "the resurrection of life," so there must be also a resurrection of the unjust, "the resurrection of damnation;" that as Christ said to the charitable person, "Thou shalt be blessed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just," Luke xiv. 14. so it may be said to the wicked and uncharitable, Thou shall be accursed at the resurrection of the unjust. For there shall be a resurrection that there may be a judgment; and at the judgment there shall appear sheep on the right hand of the Son of man, and goats on the left: therefore both shall rise; those to receive the blessing, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom, &c."—these to receive the sentence, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, &c."—Matt. xxv. 34, 41.

583. (*b*) *Not* to *some only, but all, both* of the *just and unjust*....."As in Adam *all* died, so in Christ shall *all* be made alive;" 1 Cor. xv. 22. Christ has a right as *Lord* of the dead to raise them *all* to life; [*see par.* 569.;] "the resurrection" called indefinitely "of the dead" comprehends them universally. "By man came death, by man came

---

Resurrection belongs not to the just alone, but to the unjust also. 583. And, further, to *all* both of the just and unjust.

also the resurrection of the dead," 1 Cor. xv. 21. and so the resurrection adequately answers to death. Christ shall "destroy death," not destroyed if any one still be left dead.—"The hour is coming in the which *all* that are in the graves shall hear His voice, &c." John v. 28. And at the judgment following the resurrection, "when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of His glory, before Him shall be gathered *all nations*;" Matt. xxv. 32. "We shall *all* stand," "we must *all* appear, before the judgment seat of Christ, &c." Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10. wherefore *all* the dead must previously rise.

584. IV. The Resurrection is *yet future*.—There were heretics in the Apostles' days, who acknowledged a Resurrection, yet, as Hymeneus and Philetus, "erred concerning the truth, saying that the Resurrection is passed already;" 2 Tim. ii. 18. .....They which interpret *this* Resurrection *metaphorically*, that as Christ died and rose again, so we should die unto sin and live again unto righteousness, attributing *all* to the *renovation* of the *mind*, must *deny* "the Resurrection of the *body*."

585. The Resurrection, first delivered as to come, and assuredly not yet come, is to be believed as to come at the end of the world. As Martha called it, it is "the Resurrection at the last day;" John xi. 24. Job did not expect it till "the latter day." Christ hath declared "His Father's will" that "of all which He hath given Him, He should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the

---

584. What heretics in the Apostles' days erred, (how?) in respect of the time of the Resurrection? Whom does St. Paul name as thus erring? By what interpretation of the doctrine of the Resurrection is the Article under consideration in effect denied? 585. Prove from Scripture that the Resurrection is yet to come, at the end of the world.

last day;" John vi. 39....."The harvest is the end of the world;" Matt. xiii. 39. We must not expect to rise from the dead till "the last trump;" 1 Cor. xv. 52. "The Lord Himself shall descend from heaven, &c." 1 Thess. iv. 16. before "all that are in the graves shall hear His voice." God shall "judge the world;" Acts xvii. 31. therefore shall raise the world; but He will not raise them to that judgment till the end of the world.

Practical uses of Belief of the Resurrection of the Body.

586. This belief is necessary: (*a*) For due acknowledgment i. *α.* Of the *wisdom* of God, inasmuch as without infinite knowledge He could not have an exact and distinct comprehension of all the particles of the bodies of all men, -and *β.* of His *power*, because without an infinite power He could not conjoin, &c. them again into the same flesh.—ii. Also *α.* Of His *mercy*, in promising life after justly deserved death,—and *β.* of His *justice* in performing that promise to all true believers, and in punishing the disobedient with everlasting flames.—(*b*) For acknowledgment of the great work of our redemption; by confessing that death could not be conquered but by death, and that we could never have obtained another life had not the Saviour of the world "abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel;" 2 Tim. i. 10.....Were it not for Him "that liveth and was dead and is alive for evermore," had not He "the keys of hell and of death," Rev. i. 18. we could never break through the bars of death, &c. But He hath undertaken to vanquish our enemies, and our "last enemy" to be "destroyed is death."....."Death is swallowed up in victory;".....'"Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ;" Hos. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 54, 57.—(*c*) To strengthen us i. Against fear of our own death;.....our fears arising from corrupted

---

586. What are the practical uses of a belief of *the Resurrection of the Body?* Quote texts.

nature we may lay down on the comforts proceeding from our faith, when assured of a life after death, to be followed by no death; ii. Against immoderate sorrow for the death of others;.....the Apostle will "not have us ignorant concerning those which are asleep, that we sorrow not even as others which have no hope;" 1 Thess. iv. 13.—(*d*) To deter us from sin, encourage us to holiness, comfort us in affliction. How can any man commit a deliberate sin while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the judgment-seat, &c.? What pleasure can entice him...for a momentary satisfaction to incur eternal rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to glory hereafter except it here become the temple of the Holy Ghost?... "I have hope," saith St. Paul, "towards God, that there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man;" Acts xxiv. 15, 16. This is the proper work of a true belief of a resurrection; he who is really possessed with this hope purifies himself, "always abounding in the work of the Lord forasmuch as he knows that his labour is not in vain in the Lord;" 1 Cor. xv. 58. This encourages all drooping spirits, sweetens all present miseries, &c.

Summary of Truths Confessed in ART. XI.

587. I am fully persuaded of this as a most necessary truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to die, so it is also determined that all men shall rise from death; that the souls separated from our bodies are in the hands of God and live, that the bodies dissolved into dust, or scattered into ashes, shall be recollected in themselves, and re-united to their souls; that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived, that the same numerical bodies which did fall shall rise; that this Resurrection shall be universal,...that all the just shall be raised to a resurrection of life, and all the unjust to a resurrection of damnation: that this shall be performed at the last day when the trump shall sound. Thus I believe THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

---

587. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief of *the Resurrection of the Body.*

ART. XII. And the Life Everlasting.

588. This Article, though not found in all, yet was expressed in many, ancient Creeds; in some by way of addition,...in others by way of conjunction with the former, "the Resurrection of the body unto everlasting life." On its connection with the former follows its true interpretation :.....it contains the state of man, after the resurrection, in the world to come.

589. As St. Paul hath taught us to express our belief of "a resurrection both of the just and unjust," so after the resurrection we are to consider the condition of them *both*.....Although "Life everlasting," as used in the Scriptures, belongs to the just alone, and is never mentioned otherwise than as a reward,.....yet the same words may be used to express the duration of *any* persons who live never to die again, *whatever* their condition. Thus "the resurrection of the dead" is taken in Scripture for everlasting happiness following the resurrection, as when St. Paul says, "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead;" Phil. iii. 11. evidently not merely a resurrection common to the just and unjust, but (*see context*) a resurrection in conformity to that of Christ: and yet the same language is used for the resurrection of all men, even of such as shall be everlastingly unhappy....

---

588. What is to be observed as to the occurrence of Article XII. in ancient creeds, and the modes in which it was there connected with the preceding Article? What, in reference to this connection, is the true interpretation of this Article? 589. What is the Scriptural usage of the expression, "Life everlasting?" Shew that it may nevertheless be (and in this Article is to be) used in a more extended (what?) sense: and that the life which *all* shall live after the Resurrection is an *everlasting* life.

All those then who shall rise from the dead shall rise to *life*, and live by a true vital union of their souls to their bodies; and because that union shall never cease,.....because it is "appointed for men once to die," and after their reviviscency never to die again, therefore the life which they shall then live must be an *everlasting life*.

590. I. As regards the *resurrection* to *condemnation*. —They who die in their sins, and shall be raised to life to appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and shall there receive the sentence of condemnation, shall be continued in that life for ever to undergo the punishment due to their sins: —under this head are contained two particulars:

591. 1. The *duration* of the *persons* of the wicked. The wicked after the day of judgment shall not be consumed or annihilated,* but shall remain alive in soul and body, to endure the torments to be inflicted on them by the justice of God, for all the sins committed by them in the body.

592. They who of late oppose the eternal subsistence and misery of the wicked strangely maintain their opinion.....as a truth delivered in the Scriptures. They tell us where the Scripture mentions destruction in hell, it speaks of *perdition*, but *no torment* there. In this sense will they understand those words of Christ, (so full of terror in the true, so full of comfort to the wicked in *their* exposition,) "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is

---

590. What truth is asserted in this Article as to the resurrection to condemnation? 591, 596 What two particulars are contained under this head? 592. Refute the argument for the annihilation of the wicked which some would found on Scripture expressions relating to their destruction, &c.; noticing the futility of such an interpretation of Matt. x. 28. ".....fear Him which is able to

* Asserted against the *covert* doctrine of Socinus.

able to destroy both soul and body in hell;" Matt. x. 28. But if this place speaks *only* of *perdition, not* of *cruciation*, it will follow that *God* is *not able* to *cruciate* a man in hell; for there can be no reason why it must be spoken of perdition only, excluding cruciation, but because He is able to annihilate, not to cruciate. No, certainly a man may be said to be destroyed, perish, &c. who is rejected and disjoined from God, the better and nobler life of man; and that person so denominated may still subsist and be in his own nature what he was before,.....and so subsisting undergo the wrath of God.....The same Scriptures which say the wicked shall be destroyed and die, say also plainly and frequently that they shall be tormented with never dying pains. "Depart from me, ye cursed," shall the judge eternal say to all the reprobates, "into everlasting fire;" Matt. xxv. 41. and, lest any should imagine the fire eternal, but not the torments....."these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."....The reprobates therefore must everlastingly subsist to endure everlasting punishment.....Nay the life eternal may as well be affirmed to have an end as the everlasting punishment; the original epithet is the same in both cases; (*ἀιώνιος.*)

593. Indeed the eternity of that fire prepared for the devil and his angels sufficiently demonstrates the eternity of such as suffer in it; the question only can be what that eternity signifies. For because some things in Scripture are called eternal which have but a limited duration, some may imagine the fire of hell in that sense eternal,

---

destroy both body and soul in hell,"—and the plain proof of the orthodox doctrine contained in the sentence passed on the wicked, and the description of the departure of the wicked and the righteous to their respective doom: Matt. xxv. 593. Shew that the infernal fire is in the

as lasting to the time appointed by God for its duration. But.....its eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, &c. The *end* of the *burning* of *fire* is by *extinguishing*, and that which *cannot* be *extinguished* can *never end:* but such is the fire that shall torment the reprobate; it is....."unquenchable fire;" Matt. iii. 12: Luke iii. 17;....."the fire that never shall be quenched;" Mark ix. 43, &c.....the undeniable description of the place of torments is, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched;" ....."The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever;" Rev. xiv. 11.....They which are "cast into the lake of fire and brimstone shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever;" xx. 10.—"day and night," the same expression which declares the eternal happiness in the heavens; see iv. 8; vii. 15. The wicked therefore shall never be so consumed as to be annihilated, but shall subsist for ever, and be coeternal to the tormenting flames.....

594. Hence also is clearly refuted the only material argument brought against the eternity of infernal pains, *i.e.* that the wicked after the resurrection shall be punished with death, and that a second death; and so they shall be no more, nor can in any sense be said to live. For the enduring of this fire *is that very death*....."He that overcometh shall not be hurt by the second death;" Rev. ii. 11. it seems that they which shall die that death shall be hurt by it; which is inconsistent with annihilation. The living torments are the second death. "Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire; that is the second

---

largest sense of the word *eternal*, and that consequently they who shall be tormented by it shall not be annihilated. 594. Shew the futility of the argument for the annihilation of the wicked drawn from the Scriptural assertion

death ;" Rev. xx. 14. The second death, though not expressed in the oracles committed to the Jews, yet was often mentioned in their received exposition of them, as the punishment of the wicked in the life to come; and what this punishment shall be was thus revealed to St. John ; "the fearful and unbelieving, &c, &c. shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death ;" Rev. xxi. 8.

595. And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation,.....much less will the bare *phrases* of *perdition* and *destruction ;* we may as well conclude whoever says he is *undone* means thereby that he shall be no more : besides, eternity of destruction in Scripture signifies perpetual duration in misery. For when Christ shall come to "take vengeance on them that know not God, &c." "they shall be punished with everlasting destruction, &c." 2 Thess. i. 8, 9.

596. 2. The *duration* of the *pains* of the wicked. As the reprobates shall never fail to endure the torments due to their sins, so the justice of God will never fail to inflict those torments. They shall never live to pay the uttermost farthing..... One part of their misery is the horror of despair, and it were not perfect hell if any hope could lodge in it. The favour of God is not to be obtained where there is no means left to obtain it ; in the world to come is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance.....As the tree falls, so it lies : there is no change to be wrought in man within those flames, no purgation of his sin, no sanctification of his nature, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation of him. Without the mediation of Christ no man shall

---

that they shall be punished with the second death. 595. Shew that the argument for their annihilation drawn from bare *phrases* of *perdition* and *destruction* is still weaker than that just alleged. 596. Shew that the pains of the wicked shall never be remitted. What erroneous

ever enter into heaven, and when He hath delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, then shall the office of the Mediator cease.—So groundless was Origen's opinion that after some number of years the damned should be released from their torments, and made partakers of the joys of heaven, or at least try their fortunes in some regions of the world reserved for their habitation .....

567. II. As regards the *resurrection* of the *just*:—in reference to which "the life everlasting" is not to be taken in an ordinary sense, but raised to the constant language of Scripture, in which it signifies all which God hath promised, which Christ hath purchased, with which man shall be rewarded in the world to come.

598. This life eternal may be looked on as A. *Initial;* obtained in this life, an earnest of that which is to follow ;..." He that heareth My word, &c. hath everlasting life, &c." John v. 24....B. *Partial;* belonging though to the nobler yet but to a part of man, the *soul* of the just separated from the body; enjoyed by the saints between the hour of their death and the last day..... consisting in the happiness conferred on the soul departed in the fear, and admitted to the presence, of God. St. Paul had a "desire to depart and to be with Christ;" Phil. i. 23; he was "willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord;" 2 Cor v. 8; and where he desired to be when he departed, there he then was, there now is, and that with all them who ever departed in the same faith with him, and that is, with Christ, who sitteth at the right hand of God.—C. *Perfectional;* which shall be conferred on the elect immediately after

---

opinion did Origen entertain on this point? 597. In what sense is "the life everlasting" to be understood in this Article in reference to the resurrection of the just? 598. Distinguish the eternal life of the just as *Initial*, *Partial*, and *Perfectional*.

the blessing pronounced by Christ, "Come, ye blessed children of my Father, &c." Matt. xxv. 34.—This eternal life is to be considered

599. 1. In the *possession* as it is *life*. This life is not only natural, *i. e.* the union of the soul to the body,.....but spiritual, which consists in the union of the soul to God;" "He that hath the Son hath life, &c." 1 John v. 12., especially called *life* because of the *happiness* attending it, which consists (so far as revealed) in these particulars:

600. (*a*) The *bodies* of the saints after the resurrection shall be transformed into spiritual and incorruptible bodies. The flesh "is sown in corruption, raised in incorruption, &c." 1 Cor. xv. 42, &c. The Son of God "shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, &c." Phil. iii. 21.

601. (*b*) The *soul* shall be exalted to the utmost perfection in all its faculties. *α*. The *understanding* shall be raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled. "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now we know but in part, but then shall we know even as we are known;" 1 Cor. xiii. 12.....Our first temptation was that we should be like God in knowledge, and by that we fell; but being raised by Christ we come to be truly like Him, by knowing Him as we are known, and "seeing Him as He is;" 1 John iii. 2. *β*. The *will* shall be perfected with absolute and indefectible holiness, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin; shall be troubled with no doubtful choice, but most

---

599. In what does the life of the saints after the resurrection consist, considered not only as natural but spiritual? Why is it especially called *life*? 599, 600. In what does the happiness (so far as revealed) of the saints in the perfectional life everlasting consist with regard to their *bodies*? 601. With regard to their *souls*?

fully and freely embrace the greatest good. γ. The *affections* shall be all set right by an unalterable regularity, and in that regularity receive absolute satisfaction.

602. (c) To this internal perfection shall be added a proportionately *happy condition*, consisting in an absolute freedom from all pain, misery, labour, and want; an impossibility of sinning, and offending God; an hereditary possession of all good, with an unspeakable complacency and joy flowing from it; and all this redounding from the vision and fruition of God.

603. 2. In the *duration* of it, as it is *eternal*. This duration is as necessary as the life itself; because to make all already mentioned amount to a true felicity there must be added an absolute security of the enjoyment, void of all fear of losing it, &c.

604. That this life shall be eternal we are assured. He who hath purchased it for us, and promised it to us, often calls it "eternal life;" it is described as "a continuing city," "everlasting habitations," an "house eternal in the heavens;" it is expressed by "eternal glory," "eternal salvation," "an eternal inheritance, &c." "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Heb. xiii. 14; Luke xvi. 9; 2 Cor. v. 1; 1 Pet. v. 10; Heb. v. 9; ix. 15; 1 Pet. i. 4; 2 Pet. i. 11. And.....this eternity is explained in terms liable to no mistake; "If any man keep My saying, he shall never see death;" "whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die;" John viii. 51; xi. 26. When "God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes, there shall be no more death;" Rev. xxi. 4.....

---

602. With regard to the *condition* in which they shall exist? 603. How is the life of the saints after the resurrection life *everlasting* in respect of duration? Why is the duration of the life equally necessary with the life itself? 604. Shew, quoting requisite texts, that the life shall be eternal.

"Our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light." .....2 Tim. i. 10.

Practical uses of Belief of the Life Everlasting.

605. This belief is necessary: I. As to the *eternity* of *torment;* (*a*) To deter us from committing sin, and to quicken us to holiness of life, and repentance for sin committed. For, "the wages of sin is death;" Rom. vi. 23., nothing can bring us to those everlasting flames but sin unrepented of; nothing can save that man from them who dieth in his sins;...They who believe the pains inflicted for sin sharp and endless have a proper and natural spur to avoid them; "who can dwell with everlasting burnings?" Isai. xxxiii. 14. (*b*) To breed in us a fear and awe of the great God, a jealous God, a consuming fire :....."Fear Him which after He hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear Him;" Luke xii. 5. (*c*) To teach us to value sufficiently the work of our redemption, to acknowledge and admire the love of God to us in Christ.....He who is sensible of the loss of heaven and the everlasting privation of the presence of God, of the torments of fire, the company of the devil and his angels, &c. and hopes to escape all these through the death of his Redeemer, cannot but highly value, and be proportionately thankful for, so "plenteous a redemption;" Psal. cxxx. 7. 2. As to the *eternity* of *felicity*: (*a*) To stir us up to an earnest desire of the kingdom of heaven and that righteousness to which such a life is promised.....How...ought we to be inflamed with a desire of the joys of heaven, and that length of days which only satisfieth by its eternity, to a performance of the commands to which such reward is promised! For as all our happiness proceeds from the vision of God, so we are certain that without holiness no man shall see Him. (*b*) To take off our inclinations from the pleasures and profits of this life, to teach us to despise all things on this side heaven, to "set our affection on things above, &c." Col. iii. 2, 3. "For where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also;" Matt. vi. 21. Therefore we

---

605. What are the practical uses of belief of *the Life Everlasting,* in reference to eternity 1. of torment, and 2. of felicity? Quote texts.

must "forget those things which are behind, &c." Phil. iii. 13, 14.—(*c*) To encourage us to take up the cross of Christ, and support us under it, &c. "reckoning that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us," which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory;" 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18; a knowledge and comfort not to be had except "we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen, &c."

Summary of Truths Confessed in Art. XII.

606. I fully assent to this as a most necessary truth, that the unjust after their resurrection and condemnation shall be tormented for their sins in hell; [that the punishment which shall be inflicted on them shall be proportionate to their sins.....so that no man shall suffer more than he hath deserved, that they shall be tormented with a pain of *loss*, the loss from God, from whose presence they are cast out, the pain from themselves, in a despair of enjoying Him and regret for losing Him, and further tormented with a pain of *sense*, inflicted on them by the wrath of God abiding on them, represented to us by a lake of fire;*] that they shall be so continued in torments for ever, so as neither the justice of God shall ever cease to inflict them, nor the persons of the wicked cease to subsist and suffer them; and that the just after their resurrection and absolution shall as the blessed of the Father obtain the inheritance, and as the servants of God enter into their Master's joy, freed from all possibility of death, sin, and sorrow, filled with all conceivable and inconceivable fulness of happiness, confirmed in absolute security of eternal enjoyment, and so they shall continue with God and with the Lamb for evermore. Thus I believe THE LIFE EVERLASTING.

---

606. Give a summary of truths confessed by him who affirms his belief of *the Life Everlasting.*

[*Inserted here from a previous recapitulatory passage omitted for the sake of brevity.]

J. HALL & SON, PRINTERS, CAMBRIDGE.

195413

238.1
P31g

Pearson, John

An alalysis of Pearson on the Creed

JAN 18 '78

195413

238.1
P31g

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary
175 Ninth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

Please stamp date in left column, write your name legibly in center column and leave right column blank. Deposit circulation card in slot marked 'Circulation cards'.

There is no date due, but books must be returned promptly upon request. Do not lend books charged to you to others. You are responsible for them.